

THE
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1863.

ART. I.—NATURAL THEOLOGY.

"THE invisible things of God," says St. Paul, "from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead." This being premised, it follows that the more deeply we inquire into nature, and the wider we make our circle of knowledge, the more will the wisdom, power, and goodness of the Creator shine forth. False views of nature, and a narrow conception of the plan of the universe and of the relation of its parts, almost necessarily lead to false views of God. We should, therefore, hail with peculiar delight the daily accessions that are made to our knowledge of nature, although there should occasionally appear phenomena which seem to militate against the wisdom and goodness of God, and may be pressed into an unholy cause by the false interpreters of nature; we should rest assured that these discrepant phenomena will be ultimately explained, and furnish new proof of the divine attributes. Just as the complex and erratic motions of the moon, which baffled the genius of Newton, and were for a long time regarded as a strong objection to his theory of gravitation, but now, being explained, afford a striking proof of its truth.

It is not necessary for us to inquire whether man without divine revelation would have had any idea of a God. The proof of the divine existence derived from nature is no more

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XV.—12

affected by the determination of this question than the truth of the Newtonian system is affected by the answer to the question, whether Kepler and Newton could have demonstrated the plan of the solar system if Copernicus had not suggested the idea to them. Pythagoras first demonstrated the theorem that bears his name; but, independently of his authority, we can prove that in every right-angled triangle the square of the hypotenuse is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides.

By Natural Theology, therefore, we mean that which can be proved concerning God from the structure of the universe, independently of the *authority* of revelation.

In appealing to the structure of the universe for the proof of the existence and character of God, it is assumed that this mundane fabric is not eternal. But we need not dwell long on this point, since there is scarcely any one that will *now* advocate its eternity. That the planetary system is not eternal, may be argued from the existence of a resisting medium in space, which has already retarded Encke's comet, and which in the course of time, probably millions of years, will stop the planets. "The chronometer of the heavens must" therefore "have been wound up within a limited time, for it has not yet run down." The continual changes that occur in the earth show that it is not self-subsisting. According to the opinion of the most eminent physicists it was once a fiery mass. Certain it is that as we descend from its surface its heat increases, so that at the depth of not many miles it must be a liquid mass. The upheaval of mountains of granite, the distortion of numerous strata of our globe's crust, and the remains of extinct volcanoes, all bear witness to the existence of powerful internal fires which exhibited themselves with great intensity in the early history of our planet, and which indeed have not yet subsided. Its oblate form shows that in all probability when its diurnal motion began it was in a fluid state. And it can be demonstrated mathematically that its present form would precisely follow from its rotating in a fluid state with the velocity it now has.

Sir Charles Lyell, who differs from most natural philosophers respecting the primitive history of our planet, nevertheless remarks:

If, in tracing back the earth's history, we arrive at the monuments of events which may have happened millions of ages before our times, and if we still find no decided evidence of a commencement, yet the arguments from analogy in support of the probability of a beginning remain unshaken; and if the past duration of the earth be finite, then the aggregate of geological epochs, however numerous, must constitute a mere moment of the past, a mere infinitesimal portion of eternity.—*Principles of Geology*.

The only form of infidelity from which Christianity has anything to fear is the *Theory of Development*. A theory of moral development has been formed by the rationalists of Germany to explain the sublime system of moral truth contained in the Bible, without recurring to divine inspiration. According to this theory the monotheism of the Jewish religion was a simple development of polytheism, and Christianity sprang up spontaneously out of Judaism. A system of natural development has been devised by certain students of nature to explain the order and harmony of the natural world without having recourse to a designing mind. The history of the moral world refutes the former theory, and the history of the natural world shows the falsity of the latter.

No writer, either in ancient or modern times, has given such a systematic theory of development as the author of "The Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation." His work is plausible, but not profound, appealing to our ignorance rather than to our knowledge. As it is one of the most popular forms of infidelity, perhaps we should say atheism, and lies directly in our way, and may be regarded as a type of the whole class, we shall examine those parts of it that mostly concern us.

We may pass by his universally diffused "firemist," his formation of the solar system by the simple operation of dynamic law, and enter at once into the *organic* world. But while we do this we are free to say that in our judgment no natural law will explain the distribution of matter in the solar system, the density of the planets, their relative distances from the sun, their inclination to the plane of their orbit, the period of their rotation, the retrograde motion of the satellites of Uranus, and the constitution of the sun himself.

The great argument for the existence and attributes of God is to be found in the *organic* world, in that wonderful variety of plants and animals, in the adaptation of means to ends, in

the great plan that is seen everywhere, from the smallest spire of grass to the largest oak, from the small infusoria to the great elephant, from the mollusca up to man. The great difficulty of the atheist, after the formation of the solar system upon the nebular hypothesis, is to stock the earth with living beings. By the operation of what law shall this be effected? We know something of the forces of nature, gravitation, chemical affinity, magnetism, and electricity. The natural philosopher may employ these forces as he pleases. He may increase the intensity of almost any of them to the greatest degree, he may combine his chemical elements, but no plant or animal can he produce. Between the combinations of matter and organic life there is a great gulf that no natural law can bridge over.

As to the origin of plants, we know of none that do not spring from seeds. They "are always produced under the influence of a living body similar to themselves, or to what they will become."* Nor is there much difficulty in regard to the manner of their dispersion over the earth from their original habitat. Winds, waters, birds, quadrupeds, and men assist in carrying out the designs of Providence by scattering them, which, upon finding a suitable condition, germinate. No operation of natural law could produce one hundred thousand species of plants. Law is power acting with uniformity. But how shall the same law produce such different results? How could the germs be formed from which the plants could be developed? About what point in the simple elements would the atoms gather? There is a permanency in the species of plants, and each one of the species was, it seems, originally created in but one locality and left to extend itself by natural means. Dr. Gray says:

All classification and system in natural history rest upon the fundamental idea of the original creation of certain forms which have naturally been perpetuated unchanged, or with such changes only as we may conceive or prove to have arisen from varying physical influences, accidental circumstances, or from cultivation.—*Botanical Text-Book*, p. 358.

Nor were all the trees in the early history of the planet of the simplest form.

In the ancient strata of the carboniferous era about five hundred species of plants have been found. Among these scarcely a trace

* Dr. Gray.

has yet been discovered of the simplest forms of flowerless vegetation. On the other hand, there appears a remarkable predominance of ferns, several of them arborescent, and plants allied to the Lycopodiums of gigantic size, many of which, called *Lepidodendra*, formed large and tall trees. Other plants of the Equisetaceæ also abound, and were of large dimensions, so that on the whole the Cryptogamic class at least exhibits in this era *very highly* organized species. There existed at the same time many species of coniferous trees, allied to the Norfolk Island pine or *Araucaria* tribe.—*Lyell's Principles of Geology*.

We will now pass from the vegetable to the *animal* kingdom. The doctrine of *spontaneous generation* of insects, once so popular, is now held by very few naturalists. Microscopical investigations have set aside all the supposed cases of spontaneous generation. To prove the doctrine would be quite impossible. It is evident that in all cases, where we are able to inquire into the origin of animated beings, they spring from parents; and as the few apparent exceptions are those which are rather too intricate for our full investigation, we have every reason to believe that it is a universal law. In reference to internal parasites, Professor Owen remarks:

The average number of the ova of the *Ascaris lumbricoides* (an intestinal worm) is sixty-four millions in the mature female. The ova may be discharged by millions, and the most of them in large cities may be carried into streams of water. An extremely small proportion is ever liable to be again introduced into the alimentary canal of the species of animal that can afford it an appropriate habitat.—*Lectures on the Invertebrate Animals*.

No single point of a tape-worm can develop a head and form a new individual; the transverse fission relates only to the dissemination of the fertile ova, from which alone *Tæniæ* are developed. The hypothesis of equivocal generation has been deemed to apply more strongly to the appearance of intestinal parasites in animal bodies than to the origin of animalcules in infusions. But if a tape-worm might be organized from a fortuitous concurrence of organic particles, or by the metamorphosis of an organic cell in the animal it infests, why that immense complication and extent of the organ for the production of normal fertile ova? The countless ova of the *Tænia*, with their hard crusts or shells and tenacity of latent life, are, doubtless, widely dispersed, and need only the accidental introduction into an appropriate nidus for ulterior development.—*Lectures on Entozoa*, pp. 54, 55.

Agassiz remarks, in reference to the mysterious appearance of animalcules in certain places:

We need only to recollect how the *Cercaria* insinuates itself into the skin and the viscera of mollusca, to understand how admission may be gained to the most inaccessible parts. Such beings occur even in the eye of many animals, especially fishes. As to the larger intestinal worms found in other animals, the mystery of their origin has been entirely solved by recent researches. All animals swallow with their food, and in the water they drink, numerous eggs of such parasites, any one of which, finding in the intestine of the animal favorable conditions, may be hatched. As respects the infusoria, we also know that most of them, the rotifera especially, lay eggs. These eggs, which are extremely minute, (some of them only $\frac{1}{134000}$ of an inch in diameter,) are scattered everywhere in great profusion, in water, in the air, in mist, and even in snow. Assiduous observers have not only seen the egg laid, but moreover have followed their development, and have seen the young animal forming in the egg, then escaping from it, increasing in size, and in its turn laying eggs. They have been able, in some instances, to follow them even to the fifth and sixth generation. This being the case, it is much more rational to suppose that the infusoria are products of like germs, than to assign to them a spontaneous origin altogether incompatible with what we know of organic development; no substantial difficulties to the axiom, "*omne vivum ex ovo*," any longer exist.—*Principles of Zoology*, pp. 171–173.

Professor Schulze, of Berlin, tried for about two months experiments in reference to spontaneous generation, using the greatest precaution to exclude the ova from the air, which he passed through sulphuric acid; but he could not discern with the microscope the slightest trace of infusoria or confervæ or of mould. M. Pasteur has very recently experimented with great care upon the same subject, and concludes that *germs suspended in the air are the exclusive origin, and the first and necessary condition of life in infusions, in putrescible bodies, and in liquids capable of undergoing fermentation*. In the face of such facts as these, one must have strong prejudice indeed in favor of a theory to maintain the doctrine of *spontaneous generation*.*

* In Silliman's Journal of Science, July, 1862, is an article on spontaneous generation, by Professor Wyman, who thus sums up the results of his experiments: "The result of the experiments here described is, that the boiled solutions of organic matter made use of, exposed only to air which has passed through tubes heated to redness, or inclosed with air in hermetically sealed vessels and exposed to boiling water, became the seat of infusorial life." Now the most obvious answer to this supposed proof of spontaneous generation is the probability that the ova or spores were not destroyed by the heating processes. How tenacious of life the ova and spores may be we are unable to say; but Humboldt remarks, in reference to certain animalcules: "They have been seen to come to life from a state of appar-

According to Kirby and Spence, there are four hundred thousand species of insects. All these species must have had a separate origin, for their habits and instincts are different, and the distinction in their species is of course founded on the fact, in part at least, that they do not intermix. We know nothing of the perpetuity of hybrid insects, if indeed such beings have an existence. How shall we develop from dead matter by means of electricity, or any other natural force, these four hundred thousand species? The combinations of matter in all these cases must have been different. There must have been in each case the designing mind which formed the species and determined the law of its reproduction. Should we grant that in the earth's primitive history the forces of nature were more powerful than they are now, the atheist would gain nothing by the concession; for, unless some connection can be shown between the quantity of natural forces and organic life, their increase is of no avail. We know that too great a quantity of electricity will *destroy* animal life, but it has never been known to bring the dead to life. No natural philosopher can produce *life*, combine his forces as he will. It is the prerogative of God alone to do this. Cuvier says:

Life exercising upon the elements which at every instant form part of the living body, and upon those which it attracts to it, an action contrary to that which would be produced without it by the usual chemical affinities, it is inconsistent to suppose that it can itself be produced by these affinities.

The next step in the atheistic theory is to develop the low organizations formed by spontaneous generation into beings of a higher order; to develop fish into reptiles, reptiles into birds, birds into mammalia, and apes into men! Lamarck, a French naturalist, advanced a theory of development according to which an animal's wants, and efforts to satisfy these wants, with its varying conditions, produce new organs and elevate its conditions. The author of the "*Vestiges*" admits that

ent death, after being dried for twenty-eight days in a vacuum with chloride of lime and sulphuric acid, and after being exposed to a heat of 248 deg."—*Cosmos*, vol. i, p. 354. It is impossible for Prof. Wyman to prove the entire destruction of germs by heating and boiling, and we presume that his infusoria propagate their species, which would be strong proof against their having been formed spontaneously. The solutions of matter used by Prof. Wyman were *organic*, so that, if we granted the supposed cases of spontaneous generation, it would furnish no proof that matter in an inorganic state, its natural condition, could give rise to life.

this theory is insufficient to explain the phenomena of organic nature, and he proposes the theory of *protracted gestation* as the means of elevating an animal from a lower to a higher order. In answering this theory, that we may not be imposed upon by words, let us first inquire, What is meant by development? *To develop is simply to unfold, to reveal what lay concealed*; just as the butterfly may be regarded as a developed caterpillar, which, according to Swammerdam and some other naturalists, contains the germs of the wings of the future butterfly. Now the theory of development obviously presupposes that nearly (if man be an exception) the whole animal creation is *undeveloped*. Fish are undeveloped reptiles, reptiles undeveloped birds and mammalia, and apes undeveloped men! One ape, or a small number of them at most, gave birth to the human race. What has retarded the development of all these animals? We know from experience that the tadpole, the offspring of the frog, becomes a frog, and that the ovum of the butterfly, after having passed through its metamorphosis, becomes a butterfly; the offspring rises no higher than the parent, and we know of no case where it does rise higher. If the lower orders of creation are not the higher ones undeveloped, if they had not the germ of humanity concealed in them, they could never rise to humanity. If they have it concealed, we are driven to the monstrous conclusion that in almost every case it is undeveloped.

According to the "Vestiges," in order to develop a higher animal from a lower one, nothing more is necessary than to *protract the period of gestation*. Now it is obvious that this requires the period of gestation in man (on the supposition that he is the most highly developed animal) to be longer than in any other animal. But the facts contradict the theory; the period of gestation in the elephant is *twenty-three* months, in the horse *eleven* months, in the dromedary *twelve*, while in the rabbit it is only thirty or forty days. In all the quadrumana, as far as has been ascertained, it is *seven* months.* According to the development theory, the period of gestation in the ape, protracted to *nine* months, produced the human being. Now, according to all just principles of reasoning on that hypothesis, (and the theory asserts that the fetal brain passes through the condition

* Martin's Man and Monkeys, p. 175.

of an ape's brain before it becomes that of man,) the human being in the seventh month of fetal development should be an ape. Yet have we ever heard of seven months' children being apes? And should not Kepler, who was a seven months' child, have been an ape instead of being the greatest of astronomers?

The advocates of the development hypothesis appeal to the "stony science" in confirmation of their theory; to the "stony science" they shall go, for we are assured that that venerable tribunal will give judgment against them. Our first witnesses are the placoid fishes, which stand high in the scale of organization, and yet are found in one of the earliest formations, the upper Silurian. All the animals of the Silurian period "must have been to a certain extent cotemporaneous; they exhibit some instances of very imperfect and some of the *most perfect* development of the great kingdom of nature to which they belong."* According to the development hypothesis *all* of them ought to have been of low organization. These animals, in respect to development, held a close analogy to the present system of nature, highly organized and lowly organized beings existing cotemporaneously. We have also in the Silurian strata shells of a "carnivorous animal like the cuttle-fish, a creature of high and complicated organization among the invertebrata, and which seems to have been introduced among the *very earliest of the species* intended to people the primeval seas." The trilobites, one of the earliest forms of organic life, had eyes as perfect as those of any crustacean now living. To these witnesses we may add the "asterolepis" of Hugh Miller, found in the old red sandstone, belonging to a class of fish of the highest order that has ever been called into existence. These fish appear to have varied in length from five to twenty or twenty-five feet. Leaving the lower strata and traveling upward, we have in the new red sandstone of the Connecticut valley, to say nothing of the animals in the coal formation, footprints of various animals. Thirty of these are believed to be those of birds, four of lizards, two chelonians, and six of batrachians. Some of these birds had feet four times as large as the ostrich. Speaking of the large saurians in the Permian or Triassic formation, Lyell remarks:

* Ansted's Ancient World, p. 40.

This family of reptiles is allied to the living monitor, and its appearance in a primary or paleozoic formation, observes Mr. Owen, is opposed to the doctrine of progressive development of reptiles from fish, or from simple to more complex forms; for if they existed at the present day, these monitors would take rank at the head of the Lacertian order.—*Manual of Geology*, p. 306.

Birds and mammalia, though they may be numerous, are to but a small extent buried in deposits, and their absence from any formation is by no means a proof that they had no existence when that formation was made. The domain of the higher orders of animals is by geological discoveries continually extending downward, so that no geologist can assign them definite limits in the past history of the organic world. To build a theory on very partial knowledge is the bane of true science.

Very recently Mr. Darwin put forth a theory on the "Origin of Species," in which the ground is taken that species are variable, and that all the forms of organic life may have sprung from a few individuals at most. He says:

I believe that animals have descended from at most only four or five progenitors, and plants from an equal or lesser number. . . . I should infer from analogy that probably all the organic beings which have ever lived on the earth have descended from some one primordial form, into which life was first breathed.

On this theory, that beautiful adaptation of means to ends, those exquisite contrivances that on every side strike the eye and fill us with wonder and admiration, surpassing the highest works of human art, were not thus formed by a creative hand, but are merely the result of a long series of improvements in nature herself, which, like man, ever carries forward her works to perfection, selecting the good and casting the bad away. In Mr. Darwin's theory, "Natural Selection" is the great creative and transforming power of organic nature. He tells us that,

Owing to the struggle for life, any variation, however slight, and from whatever cause proceeding, if it be in any degree profitable to an individual of any species, in its infinitely complex relations to other organic beings and to external nature, will tend to the preservation of that individual, and will generally be inherited by its offspring. The offspring, also, will thus have a better chance of surviving; for, of the many individuals of any species which are periodically born, but a small number can survive. I have called this principle, by which each slight variation, if useful, is preserved, by the term of Natural Selection, in order to mark its relation to man's power of selection.

It matters not how complex the organs may be, however striking the contrivances, natural selection can effect them. This is the magician's wand that relieves him of every difficulty and brings about every result. Mr. Darwin says:

To suppose that the eye, with all its inimitable contrivances for adjusting the focus to different distances, for admitting different amounts of light, and for the correction of spherical and chromatic aberration, could have been formed by natural selection, seems, I freely confess, absurd in the highest possible degree. Yet reason tells me, that if numerous gradations from a perfect and complex eye to one very imperfect and simple, each grade being useful to its possessor, can be shown to exist; if, further, the eye does vary ever so slightly, and the variation be inherited, which is certainly the case; and if any variation or modification in the organ be ever useful to an animal under changing conditions of life, then the difficulty of believing that a perfect and complex eye could be formed by natural selection, though insuperable by our imagination, can hardly be considered real.—P. 167.

Again he tells us: "The belief that an organ so perfect as the eye could have been formed by natural selection, is more than enough to stagger any one." Yet Mr. Darwin resolutely believes it, and censures those as prejudiced who have not the same marvelous faith. Surely he can call no Christian credulous after this, for the Bible makes no such heavy demand upon our faith as this theory does. We might entitle Mr. Darwin's book, "Creation made Easy." The only difference between his theory and the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid is that Mr. Darwin's theory requires a long time for transmutations, while in the poet they are sudden. Mr. Darwin does not tell us what was the form of the primordial being from which all others have been derived. It appears, however, to have been the simplest kind of living being, blind, deaf, and dumb; the light surrounded it, but there was no eye to receive it; sounds vibrated, but there was no ear to receive them; it was left by its Maker to do the best it could, and either to perish or wait for improvement.

But it may be asked, What is the object of such an hypothesis? And the evident answer is, To avoid the interposition of divine power in the creation of the various species of living beings. He rejects the creation of each species because it is miraculous. In this respect he resembles the rationalist, who for the same reason rejects the miracles of Christ; with this dif-

ference, however, that if the rationalist believed in one miracle, he would probably believe in all of them. Mr. Darwin affects to believe in one act of creation and rejects all the rest. But if the Almighty created a single being in the beginning, why should he not have made it perfect? And why should he not have created more than one being? As the order of nature was interrupted, the amount of that interruption makes but little difference.

Besides this, Mr. Darwin, like other philosophers, is seeking after *unity* in nature. But may it not be just as absurd to seek this unity in creation as it is to search for the philosopher's stone? Is it probable that the sixty-two elements of modern chemistry can be traced up to or resolved into one primal element? That, indeed, would seem to be impossible, for variety could never spring from such unity. So far from this being the case, we have reason to believe that chemical science will increase the number of simple elements in the future as it has done in the past. Gravitation, chemical affinity, electrical and magnetic attraction, may all be the modifications of one law; but these modifications must be as old as matter itself, and they must have been made by the Creator. When we have ascribed the various races of men to one primitive pair, assigned one separate origin to each species of plants and animals, and have found a plan in creation, we have perhaps sought far enough for unity in nature.

Mr. Darwin rejects with contempt the idea of a *plan* in creation. To him, similarity of plan is a proof that all animals are modifications of a primitive being. On the hypothesis that nature is the product of a Supreme Intelligence, we should expect with confidence to see a plan in the organic world, and its absence would strongly militate against the doctrine of a creative intelligence. The construction of the organic world upon a plan, variously modified to meet the changing conditions of organic beings in different periods of the globe's history, and in different states in the same period, indicates the highest wisdom. Nor is this plan arbitrary; for what other plan of organic structure would be so suitable? The arrangement of the organs of sense, of locomotion, in short, the whole structure, is admirably adapted to the convenience of the animal and to give it symmetry. We ourselves work upon a plan. Our houses, ships, steamboats, are all built upon a plan.

In proof of the great changes to which organic beings are subject, Mr. Darwin brings forward a large number of remarkable variations in domestic fowls, especially pigeons. But these changes take place in the hands of man, under domestic culture; whether such varieties would be produced in a wild state is the question to be determined. We certainly know of no such changes in wild animals, and even those variations that occur in domestic animals have their limits. We have not a particle of proof that pigeons could be changed into any other fowl, or into a quadruped. Were these varieties of the tame pigeon, to which Mr. Darwin refers, turned out into a wild state, they would most probably revert to the original type, to which all varieties have a strong tendency.

Yet even domesticated animals do not all undergo great change. Camels have been used in Asia and in Africa from the earliest times. We have of them but two species; they have suffered but little change. Among the animals embalmed by the ancient Egyptians were the bull, dog, and cat. Mummies of these animals, embalmed three thousand years ago, were brought to Paris under Napoleon, and examined by the French naturalists:

Now such were the conformity of the whole of these species to those now living, that there was no more difference, says Cuvier, between them than between the human mummies and the embalmed bodies of men of the present day. Yet some of these animals have since that period been transferred by man to almost every climate, and forced to accommodate their habits to the greatest variety of circumstances. The cat, for example, has been carried over the whole earth, and within the last three centuries has been naturalized in every part of the New World, from the cold regions of Canada to the tropical plains of Guiana, yet it has scarcely undergone any perceptible mutation, and it is still the same animal which was held sacred by the Egyptians. Of the ox, undoubtedly, there are very many distinct races: but the bull *Apis*, which was led in solemn procession by the Egyptian priests, did not differ from some of those now living.—*Lyell's Prim. Geol.*, p. 564.

No one species of animal has, perhaps, passed through more changes, and been affected more in his transmigrations, than the dog, the faithful companion of man. Yet "in all the varieties of the dog," says Cuvier, "the relation of the bones with each other remains essentially the same; the form of the teeth never changes in any perceptible degree, except that, in some

individuals, one additional false grinder occasionally appears, sometimes on the one side, sometimes on the other."* There is indeed a stability and permanency in species which all the hostile influences of climate, food, and the art of man cannot destroy. And the entire history of the organic world furnishes us with not a single instance of the transmutation, of the development of an animal of a lower into one of a higher organization.

One of the strongest proofs of the original reality and permanency of species is furnished by the sterility of hybrids. Were hybrids fruitful, it would be impossible to classify either the animal or vegetable kingdom. And generally, the fertility of the offspring is the proof that the parents are of the same species. Mr. Darwin discusses at considerable length the question of the sterility of hybrids, and endeavors to show that this sterility does not always exist, and that consequently it is not an insuperable objection to his theory of transmutation. But whatever modification we may have to make to the statement, *Hybrids are sterile!* its essential truth remains unshaken. It is the art of man that brings about a union that gives rise to hybrid animals, for the opposite sexes of different species have an aversion to union.

The most palpable objection to Mr. Darwin's theory of transmutation is the fact of the classification of plants and animals. If all the forms of organic life were natural modifications of a single being, produced in a long series of ages, the gradations should be insensible. Why does not this insensible gradation exist in nature? What has become of all the intermediate forms?

On Mr. Darwin's theory, what our eyes behold are nature's best productions, which have withstood the storms and conflicts of the past ages; while the imperfect beings lie wrecked all over the illimitable abyss,

Thick as autumnal leaves that strew the brooks
In Vallambrosa.

But is it not singular that none of these imperfect beings have been driven upon our shores by some favorable wind? However violent the conflict of life may have been, some should have survived.

But let us ask the geologist, whose office it is to explore the

* Lyell's Prim. Geol., p. 562.

ruins of the past world, whether he knows anything of these imperfect products of nature. His answer is in the words of Lyell: "In whatever direction we pursue our researches, whether in time or space, we discover everywhere the clear proofs of a Creative Intelligence, and of his foresight, wisdom, and power." The geologists tell us that they have examined the organic remains of miles of the globe's crust, from the trilobites of the Silurian system, one of the earliest forms of organic life, to the mastodons of the drift period, and that divine wisdom shines through them all.

Mr. Darwin supposes that the eye was formed by a long series of improvements; and yet the eyes of the trilobite were as perfect as those of any living being. Imperfect eyes are to be found neither in the present nor past organic world. They exist in the imagination of our author only. Thousands of years ago, we know that the eyes of man and many other animals were as perfect as they are now. The eye undergoes no change; and even if it did, the improbability that all these changes would conspire to form the perfect eye is as millions to one. The same holds true of the ear, the hand, and of all the other exquisitely contrived parts of the human frame.

The geologists are almost unanimous in declaring that the animals of the present world could not be derived from those of the lower strata. They find in the past world no transmutation of species. Mr. Darwin admits that all the most eminent paleontologists, namely, Cuvier, Owen, Agassiz, Barrande, Falconer, E. Forbes, etc., and all our greatest geologists, as Lyell, Murchison, Sedgwick, etc., have unanimously, often vehemently, maintained the immutability of species. "I feel," says he, "how rash it is to differ from these great authorities, to whom with others we owe all our knowledge." He thinks, however, that Lyell now hesitates in his opinion.

Mr. Darwin's theory demands that all the earliest organic beings perished without leaving a trace behind. The fossil remains of the Silurian system contradict his theory. Hence this could not be the earliest formation. Geologists have not been able to find animals in a state of transition from one species to another, and he, therefore, contends that the geological record is imperfect. He grants, however, that few geolo-

gists will admit that this record is as imperfect as his theory requires.

But in order to get a clear view of the absurdity of the Darwinian theory, let us see how it proceeds in a single case, that of the goose. Mr. Darwin supposes that this fowl once had four legs (*anser quadrupes*!) Now as all changes in nature, according to Mr. Darwin, are slow, there was a time when the fore-feet could not be used to advantage either as feet or wings, and this unfavorable position in the struggle for life with animals of the same class possessing more advantages, would have insured its destruction before it became a winged biped. It is amusing to see Mr. Darwin gravely assert that the flying squirrel is in a state of transition to a winged animal. There is not the slightest indication of the fore-feet becoming wings. There are simply phalanges on both sides of the animal, connecting the fore and hind feet. This is likewise true of the colugo and other flying quadrupeds.

Mr. Darwin ransacks the whole creation to find arguments in support of his theory, every one of which he could easily answer, and to find instances that seem to clash with design in creation. He cites the case of upland geese with webbed feet, which rarely go into the water; woodpeckers in the plains of La Plata, where not a tree grows. We see here no great difficulty; for may not beings occasionally get out of the sphere for which they were created, just as the Arabian locust is sometimes thrown into Hyde Park, and as aerolites are hurled from their orbits upon the earth?

It must, however, be admitted that Mr. Darwin's theory explains some facts; and what hypothesis will not do that? But it is just as far from explaining the phenomena of organic nature as is the Ptolemaic system from explaining the facts of astronomy. Nor do we think that there is any probability that it ever will be accepted by the scientific world as a satisfactory exposition of the phenomena of the animal and vegetable kingdoms. The author of the "Vestiges" repudiates Lamarck's hypothesis; Mr. Darwin rejects that of the "Vestiges," and his own will doubtless share the same fate.

That the human race is of recent origin is one of the most firmly established facts. The earth's crust, to a depth of several miles, has been more or less examined by the geologist. The

internal forces have thrown up the strata that would otherwise have remained inaccessible, enabling him to read with comparative ease the numerous pages thus unfolded. Yet among the many fossils of the animals of the past history of our planet, fossils scattered throughout its miles of strata, no remains of man or of any of his works have been found, except in the most recent formations. Had man existed during the deposition of the various strata in which no memorial of his existence has been found, it would be strange that he left no trace of that existence, no carved stone or wood, no footprints, no ruins of cities, not a single bone or impression. No animal is so active as man; none ventures out as he does upon the deep; none is so likely to leave traces of his existence. Some animals, on account of their constitution, are confined to certain localities, while man is strictly a cosmopolite. Let us, however, for the sake of the argument, suppose that man *did* exist during one of the older formations, say the Oolitic, though by no means the oldest, cotemporary with its great saurians, yet owing to the fewness of his numbers, and the small extent of his migrations, that no geologist has yet been so fortunate as to meet with his remains: we would indeed expect, with a considerable degree of confidence, to find vestiges of his existence in the next higher formation, the Wealden; for during the lapse of many years he must have spread extensively over the earth. But supposing, what is extremely improbable, that he existed during all these stages, where we find no remains of him, he would certainly be found in the Cretaceous formation. Such, however, is not the case; for we must travel upward through many deposits before we reach his remains. By such a course of reasoning we can show the impossibility of man's having been long upon the globe, to say nothing of the impossibility of his having been eternal. The argument of the old divines, that it is impossible for a *contrived* being to be eternal, though we admit its force, is now no longer necessary. Geology says nothing about its abstract possibility, but she says emphatically, *man is not eternal*.

Within the last few years, however, large quantities of flint implements, worked by the hand of man, have been found in the drift in the valley of the Somme, in France, which would seem to indicate that man's origin was not quite so recent as

had been supposed. But it is impossible to calculate with any degree of certainty the number of years that elapsed since the drift period. It is true that some of the animals of that period, as the mastodon and the megatherium, have become extinct, although we have no proof that these animals were cotemporary with man.

Prof. H. D. Rogers, who has examined these flints in the drift, remarks in reference to their age :

The diluvium of geologists has, since the days of the illustrious Cuvier, been always looked upon as something very ancient, simply because he and his successors, finding it replete with the remains of huge land animals no longer living, never succeeded in detecting in it a solitary bone or tooth of a human being, nor indeed anything indicative of man's existence; but now that things indicative of man have been found, it is surely illogical, and a begging of the very question itself, to impute an age incompatible with the fact of his then existing. I would repeat, then, that a specially remote age is not attributable to the flint-carving men of the diluvium, simply because it is the diluvium or mammoth-embedding gravel which contains them. If their association with these extinct mammals *does* intimate a long pre-historic antiquity, the evidences of this are to be sought in some of the other attendant phenomena. The age, therefore, of the diluvium, which incloses the remains of the extinct mammalian animals, must now be viewed as doubly uncertain, doubtful from the uncertainty of its coincidence with the age of the flint implements; and, again, doubtful even if this coincidence were established, from the absence of any link of connection between those earliest traces of man and his *historic ages*. In conclusion, then, of the whole inquiry, condensing into one expression my answer to the general question, whether a remote pre-historic antiquity for the human race has been established from the recent specimens of man's handiwork in the so-called diluvium, I maintain it is not proven; by no means asserting that it can be disproved, but insisting simply that it remains *not proven*.

Paleontologists distinguish three ages of man in Europe: the age of stone, the age of bronze, and the age of iron, so called from the material of which implements were made during these respective periods. At the place where the Tinieres empties into the Geneva lake in Switzerland is formed a cone of deposit; a railway excavation made through this cone to the depth of nearly twenty-three feet lays open the strata containing implements used by man in different periods of his existence. Mr. Morlot has calculated the time necessary for the formation of

the whole of this cone, and found it to be from seventy-four to one hundred and ten centuries.* Calculations of this kind, although not to be relied upon as fixing with any accuracy the antiquity of man, are valuable as showing his very recent origin, an event of a few thousand years ago.

Now we have in the introduction of man upon our planet the strongest proof of the existence of an intelligent and powerful Deity. The atheist cannot argue that man is eternal; and it is impossible to develop him from the lower animals. He stands alone, distinguished from the brute creation by bearing the image of his Maker—a moral and intellectual image—and reflecting the glory of the divine character. We point the atheist not to the stars, but to *man*, as being the noblest visible monument that the Creator has ever erected of his existence, power, and wisdom.

As it is from the ape tribe that the atheist derives the most glorious of the creation of God, let us take a look at them, and see whether we can recognize in these hairy creatures our distinguished progenitors. Now the first thing that strikes us is that they are all dumb, and cannot walk erect. This surely looks as if they could not be our ancestors. And the more we examine them, the more striking does their difference from us appear. Of all the ape tribe, the chimpanzee approaches nearest man. The gorilla, a large species of ape, brought to light a few years ago, is placed by Prof. Owen next to man. St. Hilaire, Duvernoy, and Wyman place the gorilla below the chimpanzee in the scale of organization, and in this we think most naturalists will agree with them. In the Smithsonian Institution is a cast of the head of a gorilla from the Imperial Museum of Vienna; likewise two casts of skulls of the same animal. Comparing these heads with the head of the chimpanzee, we are led irresistibly to place the latter next to man. One of the most striking peculiarities in the head of the gorilla, is the crest on the skull extending from the front to the back of the head, with deep cavities on each side. The principal differences between the chimpanzee and man are the following: "The existence of four hands instead of two, the inability to stand erect, consequent on the structure of a skeleton adapted to an arboreal life, the excessive length of the arms, the com-

* See an interesting paper on this subject in the Smithsonian Report for 1860.

paratively short and permanently flexed legs, the protruding face, the position of the occipital condyles in the posterior third of the base of the skull, and the consequent preponderance of the head forward," the largely developed canine teeth, which, when the mouth is shut, do not strike against but overpass each other, and the elongated pelvis. The hand is a rude imitation of the human organ. The thumb is short and not opposable to the fingers. Nor does the hand possess the feeling of touch like that of man. In many respects the muscles likewise differ from those of man. To these differences between the chimpanzee and man we must add the absence of the divine gift of reason, that discursive power of the human intellect that generalizes universal nature, analyzes the soil, measures the distances of planets, and weighs their masses. But there is nothing in which man is so unlike the highest developed ape as in the possession of a moral nature, the feeling of moral obligation. Man feels too that he has a connection with a higher power, and with an invisible world. How shall all these faculties be developed from the brutish ape? We doubt very much that the ape has as much sagacity as the dog. In proportion as other animals approach man in physical structure, we do not see that they approximate him in intellect. Nor must we omit the important fact, that while the ape tribe is confined to a tropical zone, and dies soon after he leaves it, man has a constitution adapted to every clime.

Now the question arises, How does Mr. Darwin's theory of natural selection apply to the development of man from the ape? Mr. Darwin has made no attempt to apply it; it does not suit at all. Where are the intermediate forms between the chimpanzee and man? What could have destroyed these intermediate forms? They must have, in most respects, possessed advantages over the ape tribe; and although their position was inferior to higher orders—the races of man in his present development—they could as well have existed contemporaneously with him as apes now do, or as inferior races of men alongside of superior ones.

We cannot leave this part of our subject without noticing a human skull and part of a skeleton that were discovered in 1857 in a cave between Düsseldorf and Elberfeld. This skull has been thought to indicate a nearer approach to that of the

chimpanzee than is presented in the skulls of living human races. This skull has a supraciliary ridge which is found in the gorilla and chimpanzee, but not in the orang-outang. The London Geologist remarks on this skull that it has

A very fair development of brain, and in the general shape of the skull (the supraciliary ridge apart) we find nothing which approximates to the gorilla; no interparietal crest, obliterating the sagittal sutures, extends along the head; none of the other characters that so prominently differentiate the human from the simian sub-kingdom are to be found in this ancient skull. It is not cerebrally inferior to the Papuan or negro races."

If this is a fair specimen of the skulls of the inhabitants of Europe at the early period to which it belongs, it is strange we have no other skulls with this supraciliary ridge, either living or fossil. Nor do we see any good reason to believe that civilization develops the skull and brain. In the earliest age of man in Europe, the age of stone, the skull was round: no approach to that of the ape. From a cursory examination of the skulls in the Smithsonian Institution, we cannot perceive any development of skull produced by civilization. Nor is it true that the brain of the negro is of small capacity. Sir William Hamilton and Prof. Tiedmann have incontrovertibly established the fact that the brain of the negro is not less than that of the European, and greatly larger than Hindoo, Ceylonese, and sundry other Asiatic brains. While living quadrumana are separated from man by such a wide interval, it is impossible to fill up the gap by fossil forms. A few years ago the fossil remains of a quadrumanous animal, *dryopithecus*, was found in the upper Miocene formation. From the two branches of the lower jaw and the humerus, Lyell declared that it "came nearer to man than any quadrumanous species living or fossil before known to geologists." To this Prof. Owen replies that the statement is "without the support of any adequate fact, and in contravention of most of those to be deduced from Mr. Lartet's figures of the fossils."

That there should have been, to a certain extent, progress in the creation of God, the formation of the highest being, man, last, coincides better with our views of the divine proceeding than would the creation of the lower animals after man. The various orders of animated existence were introduced at that time when the earth suited their respective conditions. The

great object of the Deity, as far as we can learn it from the plan of creation, was the introduction of man upon our planet.

The fundamental argument for the existence of an intelligent Creator is that design must have had a designer, or, to express it more philosophically, that the adaptation of means to a certain end, or conspiring to produce certain results, implies design. For design and designer are as much correlative terms as effect and cause. So that the only possible question is, whether there is *design* in nature. Now it is not possible for us to reason upon this subject, and scarcely upon any other, without reference to ourselves. The idea of a connection between effect and cause has been most probably derived from our own experience and consciousness. We are conscious of a connection between our own volitions and acts; we know that we *cause* certain things, and we are led immediately to the truth that there is a cause of the great phenomena of nature. We know that there must be a cause of planetary motion; that if a planet keep its orbit, there must be a cause for it; that if a new being is introduced upon the earth, there must be a cause for it. Hardly any one, we presume, will attack this principle, and the same course of reasoning will apply to the design in nature. We are conscious of designing things, of adapting means to ends; and we also ascribe *design* to other men in their works, although these works may far surpass anything that we ourselves can do. We indeed know from experience, that if intelligence does not direct affairs, they almost invariably go wrong; we know that it is not *natural* that every thing should turn out right. Confusion and apparent chance are evident all through mundane affairs. But in the midst of all this, we find animated nature bearing the most striking instances of order and harmony; a wonderful relation of parts, of means to ends, that are beneficial.

Furthermore, we not only ascribe design to men, but also to some of the lower animals; to others, instinct. If a reasoning animal performs actions of a certain kind, we impute them to *design*. If another animal by instinct acts in a similar manner, is it not clear that there must still be design somewhere? if not in the animal, then in its Maker. This remark will apply to the bee's cell, constructed on the highest mathematical principles.

The ear is formed with reference to sound; and the eye, implying a most profound knowledge of optics, is precisely

adapted to the laws of light, varying in different animals to suit their condition. Can it be any more doubted that the eye was formed for vision than that the telescope and microscope were formed to assist vision? If there were but a few instances of apparent design in nature, we might think *it happened* so; but the uniformity of design forbids it.

It is sometimes sneeringly said by the atheist, that our belief in God is the result of our ignorance; that when we are unable to trace out the natural causes of things we fly to a Deity; and that when the sciences shall have reached a greater degree of perfection, and the relations of the universe shall have been better understood, there will be no need of resorting to a Deity to explain the phenomena of nature. Now we admit that natural philosophy does in some cases remove the Deity to a greater distance from us, but does not dispense with his agency. Remove the first cause as far back as we please, we must soon or later place him at the head of all nature. Whatever explanation may be given of the phenomena of nature, design and contrivance will still remain. But it is nevertheless true that in the explanation of natural phenomena we have in many cases reached an *ultimatum*. We know that it is necessary for vision that an image of the object be formed upon the retina of the eye, and we know that the eye is wonderfully adapted to this purpose, surpassing in perfection the best optical instruments. No future discovery can change this fact; it is complete in itself. The same remark will apply to the ear in its formation for hearing. The relation of the sexes throughout organized nature is the clearest indication of design for the perpetuation of plants and animals. No future discovery in anatomy or physiology can change it. The same is true of nearly all other phenomena. Our belief, therefore, of the existence of a Supreme Intelligence is based upon *positive knowledge*. The fact is, science has furnished the strongest proofs of the divine existence. The telescope has revealed to us innumerable worlds, while the microscope has disclosed to us millions of sentient beings. Geology has augmented to an astonishing degree our knowledge of the past history of our planet. The anatomist has increased the number of instances of exquisite and delicate contrivances in the organization of our frame.

The Deity that the universe proclaims to us is not simply a power but a *person*. The mere existence of power or motion does not, perhaps, prove the existence of intelligence; but where there is contrivance and design directing forces to beneficial ends, there must be strict *personality*. We see no way of avoiding the conclusion. The acts of a mind prove the existence of a mind. Our minds are also a proof of the intelligence of the First Cause, for none but an intelligent Being could produce intelligence. That the Deity is not the object of our senses is not strange, since the most active powers of nature are the most concealed. Nothing but gross matter is the object of sense. Gravitation, chemical affinity, and terrestrial magnetism are invisible. Of man, *mind* is the all-important part, but our senses take no cognizance of it; our minds are mutually concealed from each other. The anatomist may dissect the human brain, and search the abode of intellect, but search in vain; it perpetually eludes his grasp. The great intellects of Newton and Milton were known to the world only by their works. In the same manner we are to judge of the existence and character of God. The existence, therefore, of an Intelligent Cause is to be regarded as a truth of strict induction. If it is an hypothesis, it is one that is *absolutely necessary* to explain the phenomena of nature.

We may in a future article consider the moral nature in man, in its bearing upon Natural Theology.

ART. II.—STEVENS'S HISTORY OF METHODISM.

The History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism; considered in its different Denominational Forms, and its Relations to British and American Protestantism. By ABEL STEVENS, LL.D. Vol. III. From the Death of Wesley to the Centenary Jubilee of Methodism. New York: Carlton & Porter. London: Alexander Heylin. 1861.

THIS third volume of Dr. Stevens's "History of Methodism" will lose much of its enduring interest by being read out of connection with the two preceding volumes. The first of these

volumes containing the Wesleyan reformation in its germinant state, the second in its early development, and the third in its maturing fruit, evidently must be read in their order and connection. Thus we can appreciate the irrepressible power of the movement only when we know the resistance with which it was doomed to conflict. This the first volume describes in the variety of its forms and in the obstinacy of its character.

The great reformation of the sixteenth century found the fiercest resistance in the hierarchal usurpations which had overshadowed christendom. This stupendous system, which was the growth of centuries, and the mightiest imposture ever practiced on humanity, was the grand obstacle of the German movement. But the Wesleyan reformation grappled with another class of obstacles. The former reformation was a protest against the frightful abuses of priestly power; the latter against the practical ungodliness of the age. How rife and multiform was this ungodliness, a thousand witnesses attest. It had generated the deism of England, of which such minds as Hobbes, Tindal, Collins, Shaftesbury, Chubb, and many of smaller notoriety, were open advocates. This deism of the island was rapidly becoming the atheism of the continent, the rationalism of Germany.

The crown of England, through several reigns, having used its prerogatives to restore popery, accelerated the return of the masses to practical heathenism. The profound torpor which had paralyzed the national Church, was itself a fruitful source of general immorality. That the minister of the altar should head the mob to disperse earnest worshipers, was evincive that heartless formality had supplanted spiritual devotion, and that the establishment itself was among the most formidable obstacles to the reformation. This profound spiritual apathy was also the legitimate source of the Arianism, Socinianism, and Unitarianism so skillfully vindicated by the Clarkes, Priestleys, and Whistons of their respective ages.

This decline of truth and piety had reached its maximum, when the voices of the Wesleys, like the blast of a trumpet, broke the slumber of ages, and introduced the era of spirituality.

"The ribald burlesque and licentious humor," says our author, "of such men as Swift and Sterne, sufficiently indicate

the clerical taste of the day ;" while the works of Dryden, which are not more bright with genius than dark with vice, furnish a specimen of the demand then made by polite society. Indeed, such was the national relish for the poisoning cup of infidelity, that the works of Bolingbroke, Hume, and Gibbon had become the chosen books of large circles.

The historian has also summoned witnesses from another class, who attest to a state of morals corresponding to this virtual rejection of revealed truth. We allude to the British Essayists of the eighteenth century, comprising Steele, Addison, and Johnson. The *Tatler* of the first, the *Spectator* of the second, and the *Rambler* of the last, having the one general aim to rebuke humorously or sarcastically the vices of the age, are attestations to their prevalence. Not only had moral death pervaded the national Church, but it had also swept like a desolating flood over the dissenters. Scores of thoughtful men blended their voices of sorrow in the assertion "that *ungodliness was the characteristic of the English nation*." No voice gave utterance to this sentiment with more depth and tenderness than "good Bishop Burnet," who tearfully declared that "such was the waste of religion in the hearts and lives of men that there was fearful apprehension that it would die out of the world." This moral blight pervaded the whole period from "the restoration," till Methodism entered on its high commission to disperse the fearful gloom of that long night of almost two centuries.

The characteristics of these obstacles are the exponents of that agency which was to overcome them. Unlike the Reformation of Germany, which was a war against false doctrine, the Wesleyan movement was a conflict with dead formality and corrupt manners.

That the Christian Church is the organic form of spiritual life, is that great principle whose development is the philosophy of Methodism.

At several points our author finds a striking similarity between the incipient struggles of Christianity in the apostolic age, and those of the Wesleyan revival in the last century. In nothing was this similarity more striking than in the utter absence of all pomp and circumstance. The living truths of redemption flowed from apostles' lips not often in the temple or synagogue,

but on the ship and shore, on Mars' Hill and in judgment halls and in the jail at Philippi, in the private dwelling and by the way side, and wherever there were listening ears to drink in the "joyful sound." Equally homeless and churchless was incipient Methodism. Its most signal victories were won when its preachers, excluded from churches, raised their mighty voices beneath the open canopy of heaven; when crowded thousands hung with rapture on their artless lips; when school-rooms, private houses, and city commons witnessed the unutterable emotions of agitated crowds. There, despite of all external inconveniences, the word of life, invested with irrepressible energies, mysteriously expanded and multiplied. Thousands seemed to hear the voice from heaven which startled the German monk on the staircase at Rome, saying, "The just shall live by faith." This germinant principle of the great reformation once more developed its measureless power to disenthral and enrapture the penitent.

This third volume of Dr. Stevens's history grasps forty-eight years, being the most thrilling period of Methodism. Being the seventh and closing book of the series, it contains eighteen chapters, spread over more than five hundred pages. The author has opened the volume by most graphically depicting the last decade of the eighteenth century so far as it relates to his subject. The events of that period he shows to have been too stirring to ever fade from history. The fields will continue red that were drenched with blood, and the re-erected thrones of Europe are scarcely yet firm that it shook to the ground. But the event that most painfully interested the Wesleyan societies was the death of their *founder*.

The author has shown that this event created through the connection the profoundest concern for its continued unity and efficiency. It was regarded as pregnant with consequences which might be disastrous to the great evangelical movement. While it generated these fears on the part of friends, it rekindled the hopes of enemies. It was feared that at the last gasp of this apostolic man the fraternal bond of the connection would dissolve, and that the societies of which he had been the binding center would go off in scattered fragments. It was hoped by the foes of "the revival," that now the "*invincible agitator*" was gone, the repose of the Church would be unbroken, and the amusements of the Sabbath be resumed.

Both parties well knew the height to which that influence had reached, which had been accumulating for more than half a century, which had poured its swelling stream through the first and second generations to the third. But neither those hopes or fears have ever become a *realization*.

The powers of this unique character, formed of strong and well-balanced elements, precluded the very result that was dreaded. That power was too great and holy to be exclusively embodied in his *person*. It imbued with an ever-living spirit the entire organism which Providence had formed by his skillful hand. The agency of Wesley was of that class of moral influences which time cannot waste nor social changes neutralize. Enthroning itself firmly in the moral powers of our being, it is imperishable as they.

Both the fears and hopes, therefore, that the cause of Wesley would die with him ignored that great principle, that divine truth, inculcated by holy agency, will erect to itself monuments more durable than brass.

It is true, that never did the stroke of death fall on a more venerated head of a community. The affection of the societies was the basis of his authority. The vigor of his purpose, the purity of his motives, the power of his perseverance, the loftiness of his aim, all bathed in the light of a singular intelligence, made his sway absolute over all he served. But death could not abolish, but only transfer this power from his person to his cause. This organism, made vital in every part, would in a manner perpetuate his life through ages in an expanded form. But the calamities to the connection which were apprehended as following Mr. Wesley's death, were the more feared from the great political upheaval of Europe. The revolution in France burst on the nations like an earthquake which had engulfed the empire. The whirlwind of revolution passed over populous states, and ancient thrones tottered to their fall. No moral interest remained unscathed in its course.

This outbreak was the more desolating from its unnatural alliance with *infidelity*. This in its darkest type, in the form of atheism, for the first time in man's history, identified itself with the rights of man, and was borne forward on the popular tide to a loftier position than ever before attained. Roman superstition was the transition ground over which the national

mind passed to broad infidelity. Ages of corruption prepared it for the monstrous leap. The scene opened by this twofold agency in France is *alone in history*. God was rejected, reason deified, the immortality of man blotted out, and the eternity of death avowed. Then rolled forward the tide of fire! "The mob executioners of to-day became the mob victims of to-morrow. The streets flowed with blood, and terror sat on its throne of skulls," the nation shivered with a chill of horror on the brink of the yawning gulf. The same maddening cup was tasted by other nations; they were frenzied by the draught, and were hastening to a kindred doom.

England itself, our author has shown, was not without its sympathizers. The monstrous wedlock contracted between infidelity and liberty deluded the lovers of human rights into an advocacy for the *foul betrayers* of those rights. They rejected God in order to obtain the boon of liberty for man. Though this moral blight had not smitten England as a nation, not a few of her representative minds had received its virus, and exerted an agency to make the infection general. This deathly malady chilled the ardor of religion and loosened the bonds of society. Though the Wesleyan revival was a wall of brass against this continental flood, yet the efficiency of that revival was weakened by the infidelity of Voltaire. It cannot be concealed that the controversies among the successors of Wesley were rendered more alarming by this external hostile force; that this increased the perils of the Connection, when its peace was threatened by the death of the founder.

The character of Wesley has a solitary grandeur. It required for its development more than a single age. It is one of those rare monuments destined not to waste by the lapse of time, but to accumulate in its luster, as centuries shall unfold, the assemblage of its virtues. Still, the greatness of the man consisted not in a monarch mind, towering above all others in the largeness of its grasp; or in creative genius, which could construct an ideal fabric, gorgeous in its rainbow beauties; not in its philosophical power of lofty generalization, by which metaphysics expands the domain of knowledge; but in all the mental powers singularly perfect in their balance. If his sphere of life was not divinely chosen, unusual human wisdom presided over the choice. The adaptation of light to the eye is not more perfect

than was that of the man to his work. The execution of his life-plan required a logical, not a metaphysical mind; dialectical, not philosophical powers. His work was that of a great religious reformer, not of a scientific discoverer. *That* lies in the sphere of logic, *this* lies in that undefined territory where first principles emerge from the region of mystery. His mind acted with great power in the logical sphere, where the undimmed light of certainty shines on every step; where the data are assumed and the whole process advances by the necessary laws of thought. The scholars of his age as justly entitled him "the *logician*" as "the *Grecian*." The structure of his mind gave him the richest endowments for every sort of excellence out of the field of discovery, where the task was not to grapple with primary principles.

The errors he was to correct lay within the sphere of given principles, and chiefly within that of *revealed* truth; here he was at home. The unerring precision of his statements, the transparent clearness of his definitions, and the rigorous exactitude with which he traced to their premises all his conclusions, made his doctrinal position impregnable, and invested moral evidence with the highest authority.

But the character of this remarkable mind was less uncommon than the work which it achieved. He wrought out a plan, says our historian, which could only have been accomplished by four men of his longevity. 1. How few devoting an entire life to literature have excelled him in this department! His far-reaching plan comprised poetry, music, history, natural, moral, and political philosophy, with almost every topic of divinity. His stupendous labor swelled the number of originated and abridged volumes till it reached nearly two hundred. There is scarcely a single mode adopted in this age for the diffusion of useful knowledge among the masses which is not traceable to this comprehensive mind. Though he spoke through the press as from the pulpit "*ad populum*," his productions were not, like those of most prolific pens, superficial, but *accurate* and profound. His depth in classic lore was often betrayed by the gems from the classic page which ornamented his volumes, and his depth and perspicuity flowed from the same ancient source. 2. His travels alone might have occupied a long life. Between four and five thousand miles per year was the average distance

of his journeys, so that his aggregate travels for more than half a century was equal to ten journeys around the globe, and all this, up to his seventieth year, was performed on horseback. 3. His functions as an ecclesiastical legislator were sufficient to employ the utmost energies of an ordinary mind. The compact and vigorous system which grew up under his skillful hand bears the marks of a powerful combining intellect and of a highly practical mind. Nor was his administrative power inferior to his originating skill. The wealth and wisdom, power and policy, pride and prejudice, which combined to thwart his agency, could be baffled only by a caution and perseverance which characterize minds formed to govern. 4. The other division of his labor was in the *pulpit*. Here he had no equal. Whitefield for a season was his only competitor, but fell far behind him in this noble strife. Only in the extent of territory which he traversed did Whitefield exceed Wesley, not in the number of his sermons; while he averaged ten per week through his public life, Wesley delivered fifteen; and surviving the former more than a score of years, he delivered forty-two thousand, while Whitefield did not exceed eighteen thousand. What historical record of all the Christian ages has brought down to us a single example to equal this? Since martyrdom terminated the heroic course of the apostles, Wesley has stood *alone*, and shines in his solitary grandeur.

When it is remembered that in all these four departments this unique mind achieved complete success in the face of appalling obstacles, how can we withhold our admiration? A life protracted to within a dozen years of a century, under this immense weight of care and toil, must have been "a charmed life," a life providentially appropriated; and this has its proof in the far-reaching results of that extraordinary agency. The problem of his character has its solution in the appointment of God, and in the results of the legitimate workings of his great plan.

"His was a life," says Dr. Stevens, "which the philosopher must pronounce singularly successful and fortunate, and the Christian singularly *providential*." Unlike most great men, who die with their life-plans immature, he survived to witness the completion of his. *Substantially* his was finished before his death transferred it to other hands, only *circumstantially* was it modified after his departure. His successors were ade-

quate to *this*, after by his own wisdom *that* had been achieved. His great organic system had in its texture the elements of permanency; an accurately defined theology, a perfectly adapted literature, a well-adjusted scheme of Church government conspired to give to it strength and vitality. Well might he resign this to the operation of providential events which should continue shaping it better to work out its lofty destiny.

He lived till the storm of persecution had restrained its rage, till the tongue of slander had ceased to defame him, till personal foes had repented of their hostility or dropped into the grave. Order was the spirit that ruled his mighty life. His parsimony of time was equal only to the rigidity with which he appropriated all his waking and sleeping hours. His time for sleep commenced at nine in the evening, his hour of rising was four in the morning. Through all the rigor of the seasons, at a latitude of fifty degrees, this veteran, under the weight of eighty years, was seen rising from his bed, lighting his own fire, and resuming his life-task.

As the time of his departure approached, all his arrangements were made so as to be consummated in that event. The scene of his death was the focal point on which all the achievements of his life shed their converging lights. With an eye directed to the heavens, and with a spirit glowing in the INFINITE smile, he passed the mortal change with the calmness of infant slumbers.*

* On no merely psychological theory will the problem of Mr. Wesley's character admit of solution. All who have attempted it on such ground have caricatured rather than portrayed that great man. Viewed from the true stand-point, there is no historic character in human annals of easier solution; never was there one of greater simplicity. By ignoring the constancy and loftiness of his aim, the key to the arcana of his character is lost. This, properly considered, unravels all mystery, and simplifies every complication. The whole machinery which he worked was adapted to these *three ends*, namely: To secure men's conversion to God; to retain them in that spiritual state; and to be aggressive beyond all limitation. In accomplishing this sublime triple object he was guided by the broadest principles, impelled by the most expansive charity, and chained to his life-plan by the unity of his hallowed purpose. The Wesleyan Institute has proved itself a masterpiece of social organization for the working out of these great ends. Had it combined complicated impulses, which should secure a harmonious interaction, the utmost success would have demanded a mind unlike Wesley's. But the simplicity of the principles of his Institute furnished full scope to his great powers. Indeed, the *supernatural* element is the true key to Wesleyanism. This had so permeated all his powers and purposes, that his heart and face were bright and glowing as the sun. His whole

Few topics of his history has Dr. Stevens sketched with a more masterly hand than the Wesleyan scheme of *education*. He shows that in this, as in other prospective interests, the founder of Methodism did not allow the present to exclude the future, but acted with equal reference to both; that, penetrated with the assurance that felt religion is the quickener of the intellect, while he promoted *that*, he provided for *this*. At the very dawn of the revival he projected his educational plan. This plan burst into execution, not suddenly and prematurely, but gradually, as the educational demands of the Connection advanced. Few great leaders have furnished so practical a solution of the problem of education as connected with religion. He was profoundly convinced that while this connection was genuine, the boon of education was invaluable—that being a monument erected in mind no waste of ages could crumble it. After the Kingswood school had shone with a bright and growing luster for more than two generations; after it had shaped the character of ministers' sons for large usefulness in social positions, auxiliaries to it arose in the shape of many high schools, and in that of a normal school, whose building alone cost more than two hundred thousand dollars. Then, by the aid of princely donations, the Connection established five hundred day-schools, which impart instruction to almost one hundred thousand children. It was impossible that such an educational agency should long operate amid the great mass of Wesleyans without fastening upon them this conviction, namely, *that the standard of pulpit intelligence must be raised*. Indeed, it required no far-seeing sagacity to determine that such an agency would create this demand, and that a failure to meet it would be the fatal arrest of progress. The foresight of this had long stirred the leading minds of the Connection, which for years had looked anxiously around for means to meet this *inevitable* demand.

The founder, who contemplated the future with a more piercing eye, prophetically inquired at his first conference,

character was so radiant with genuine benevolence that his heart would have filled an angel's bosom. What account can be given of the living green of May, or the radiant bloom of spring, if the sun in the heavens be ignored? Extinguish that great magician, and all solution is impossible. So would it be with Wesley's character, apart from the eternal Beam that painted all its beauties. As the power of God was the secret of his success, the mystery of Methodism is resolvable only in that Supreme Agency.

"How can we obtain an institution for ministerial education?" A satisfactory answer to this momentous inquiry, which was reiterated from conference to conference, was postponed only by the want of fit instructors and financial resources. Meantime the desideratum was but limitedly supplied by the Kingswood school. Our author, with his characteristic exactness and elegance, traces these steps till the conference, in 1834, had reached the point when their plan burst into execution—their *theory* became a *fact*. Then he proceeds to show in the light of facts, and with the clearness of vision, that the force of those very circumstances which had originated a theological school has not since ceased to give it ample support, and that the hopes in which the conference established it have been abundantly realized in the fruits of both its branches.

This scheme, which had been maturing for more than half a century, and which had been pressed upon the attention of the conference by such powerfully combining minds as Bunting, Newton, and Watson, warranted all that confidence which experiment has since justified. But momentous as was this enterprise, and splendid as has been its success, it was not inaugurated without opposition, though the causes were various which combined to oppose it, and the hostility determined with which it was to grapple. The famous Dr. Warren was its most formidable antagonist. Indeed, he wielded all the elements of the opposition; not, as Dr. Stevens has shown, from an honest conviction that some interest of religion would be periled by the enterprise, but from the smart endured in wounded ambition, which he perceived was to be utterly disappointed by the management of the institution being committed to other hands. The iron purpose of the doctor, and of the party he represented, to shake down the Wesleyan polity, made him reckless of expense, and repeated in his appeals to the courts of justice. But that legal process issuing not in the overthrow of that polity, but in the exhibition of the adamant strength of its great principles, left no hope to the disaffected, and banished all doubt from the friends of the Connection. Our *history* embraces a most thrilling picture of the intense interest with which many Wesleyans witnessed every step of this legal inquiry—the breathless solicitude with which they waited for the decision of the court, and their irrepressible

emotions when that decision rang out full and clear in support of the conference.

But Dr. Warren, goaded on by the agitating element of his nature, had the temerity to carry the case to a higher tribunal. But here again patient investigation issued in the same triumphant result. The moral grandeur of the cause electrified the court, and convinced it that nothing but persecution could call in question its comprehensively-benevolent principles, and elicited from the judges of both courts the most expressive eulogy on Methodism. Never was there a just cause violently assailed with less success; never were the intrinsic excellencies of a vilified cause more effectually elicited by an enemy's hand.

This final decision from so high a tribunal determined for ages the legal stability of the Wesleyan system. It rang through the Connection as the blast of a trumpet, reassuring the thousands of its earnest friends.

The school of the prophets, the immediate occasion of this fierce attack, has worked to a charm, vastly exceeding the most cherished hopes of its founders. Its powerful development places it among the mightiest reinforcements of the Wesleyan ministry. About eighty young ministers now occupy those sacred halls. Nearly five hundred have issued from them prepared to do the work of evangelists. Vast portions of the itinerant field at home now smile beneath the culture of their hands. They are numerous in the foreign work, grappling with the man of sin, and with the fiercest agencies of idolatry. The cause of missions has numbered among them not only its most eloquent and tireless advocates, but its brave and triumphant martyrs. Many ages will not suffice to compute that amazing energy added by this institution to the missionary character of the Methodist ministry. So far are the Connection now from regarding it as an "*innovation*," they consider it as one of the most legitimate developments of Wesleyanism—not the introduction of a new and alien principle, but a beautiful application of the principle which the Connection has ever recognized. Thus the stupendous results of this expedient have silenced all objection, and unified the Connection in the conviction that it resulted from that far-seeing wisdom by which Providence had so long guided that powerful ministry.

Our history shows that Wesley and Whitefield were the most famous of all the stirring preachers of the eighteenth century. They were similar, however, only in the power of their piety and in the thrilling eloquence of their sermons. That original greatness stamped on the mind of Wesley had scarcely its shadow in the powers of Whitefield. The latter was merely an orator; the former added to this characteristic the depth and breadth of a philosopher. Each became the leader of one of the Methodistic divisions: Whitefield of the Calvinistic, and Wesley of the Arminian. But when that orator, whose eloquence melted and agitated crowded thousands, descended the pulpit and wielded the pen, the giant became an infant. His vindication of Calvinism was a faint echo of what had been more powerfully uttered by mightier minds in bygone ages; while Wesley's comprehensive mind, grasping the entire controversy, had carefully traced it from its incipency with Augustine through the conflicting action of the councils in the following centuries, and amid the strife of the two ancient monastic orders, and in its revival again when the long-extinguished Christian light was rekindled in the sixteenth century. But not only was Wesley familiar with the far-reaching history of this controversy, but his great logical powers enabled him to do much toward settling it. By a single glance his keen eye pierced the sophistry by which Mr. Whitefield and other better dialecticians had advocated "the decrees." He regarded the most successful attempts to improve the Calvinian scheme as ruinous of its symmetry and self-harmony. He conceded the self-consistency of it, and therefore maintained that, as a whole, it was in conflict with other universally recognized principles. The Baxterian and Edwardian modifications, seeming to mitigate the rigor of those stern dogmas, had been largely adopted. But Wesley maintained that these, and all kindred apologies for the unconditional election and reprobation of men, involve the same revolting principle which so many great minds had urged against the Augustinian dogmas; that, in fact, there could be no middle way between old Calvinism and downright Pelagianism. He repudiated all attempts to restrict the decrees to the elect, and urged that election inherently involved reprobation; that if the elect could believe only as they were necessitated, the non-elect could only disbelieve for

the want of being thus necessitated; that the correlation, therefore, between election and reprobation was such as that to cancel the one was to render the other impossible, and that, consequently, whatever objection can be legitimately urged against the decree of reprobation, lies with the same crushing force against the decree of election.

The five points on which the Synod of Dort tried and condemned the Remonstrants, Wesley regarded as involved in the controversy, whatever phase it assumed. This was suggested by the title Arminian, which he gave to his Magazine, (1778.) The doctrinal positions relating to this controversy, which were vindicated in this periodical, were these five, namely: "1. God's decrees fixing the destiny of the righteous and the wicked were conditioned on the foreseen unnecessitated character of the two. 2. That Christ having propitiated for all men, all might believe and be saved. 3. That human depravity could be subdued and regeneration effected only by the Spirit through faith. 4. That this energy of the Spirit can be repelled, as the will is free. 5. That it is possible for the regenerated to apostatize and perish."

The thread of connection running through these five topics shows them to be several parts of an indivisible whole. As neither of them could be true without involving the truth of the others, so no one of them could be false unless all were so. The sun-like clearness with which Wesley discussed these propositions in his doctrinal tracts had never been excelled. On the same questions the sprightly pen of Fletcher was more largely employed. His "Checks to Antinomianism" have shed a luster on these doctrines which a whole century has left undimmed, and which, in the hands of the Methodist ministry, have gone far to revolutionize the English and American pulpit.

The sentence in the Minutes, that "*we have leaned too much toward Calvinism,*" was the kindling spark in the magazine. As though the most blighting heresy that could peril the cardinal doctrines of Christianity had arisen, the Calvinistic Methodists arose in their might to crush it in its germ. More than six years measured this severe conflict. No controversy in the history of Methodism was more violent.

That for an entire century not a shadow of change has since appeared in the Arminian type of Methodism, is a fact elo-

quent of the argumentative power with which it was then vindicated.

The powerful advocates of Calvinism centralized around that remarkable lady, the Countess of Huntingdon. No woman in England commanded more moral power, or rallied on a great doctrinal question more literary talent.

The character of the opposing champions enhanced the interest of the spirited controversy, while the strength of the opposition to Arminianism elicited the invincible arguments which sustained it.

But of all the marked features in Wesleyan Methodism, none is invested with more moral beauty than its missionary characteristic. Nor do we elsewhere find it depicted with that simplicity, comprehensiveness, and rigid exactitude with which it is portrayed in the history before us. Dr. Stevens has shown, by ample illustrations, the spirit of missions to be vital to Methodism, and therefore to have been one of its inevitable developments. He has thus proved that the inborn power which made it expansive at home could never permit it to remain at home; that its destiny was aggression till the whole ransomed territory shall be conquered. The rapid diffusion of itself through British Protestantism was prophetic of its higher mission by which an incoming age was to be stirred. Long before this living element had embodied itself in missionary societies, its irrepressible energies had borne it to other lands. Panting for the disenthralment of the race, it made its way to the islands of the sea and to the continent of America. The doctor justly regards the foreign missionary work as the third permanent stage of the Wesleyan development. But he shows that prior to this the expansive power of this living element had extended it into Nova Scotia, (1765,) into the West India Islands, (1760,) into North America, (1769.)

The great representative of the movement in this foreign work at a later period was Dr. Coke. While this apostolic man circumstantially varied greatly from his ministerial coadjutors, *substantially* he was one with them. The same irrepressible energy which impelled them to penetrate the cottage of ignorance, the back lanes of London, and the gloomy haunts of vice everywhere to cheer dark spirits by the lamp of heavenly hope, that same spirit prompted Coke to fly to the islands of

the sea and to distant continents. After his fifth missionary voyage to America, our history traces him to the West India Islands, and exhibits his profound sympathy with the persecuted missionaries at these posts of danger.

There this great-hearted man was shocked by the barbarity of the persecution, and delighted with the heroism with which it was braved. Finding the sable crowd before the grated window of the missionary's dungeon bathed in tears, under the utterances of his heavenly message, the doctor was thrilled with renewed confidence in the success of this sublime struggle. He declared that the Spirit which sustained these buoyant sufferers was the same by which the martyrs shouted in the flames. Penetrated with the incongruity of these colonial persecutions, with the unrestricted toleration of the parent state, Coke no sooner returned to England than he shaped matters to urge it on the notice of Parliament. This appeal was completely successful. Those barbarous laws were annulled, the prison doors unbarred, and the immured heralds of Christ were once more blowing the trumpet of truth.

At this period Dr. Coke seemed the embodiment of the missionary zeal of the age. He had not merely planned, established, and supervised many missions in the British colonies, but arranged for one in Asia, on which he intended to enter in person. Though this heroic purpose was defeated by his sudden death in the midst of his voyage thither, the mission he had planned was not a failure. The missionaries accompanying him had scarcely dried the tears in which they had bathed the remains of their departed leader, when they resolved to inaugurate the enterprise for which he had given his life. The providence was startling which had bereaved them, but they were too profoundly consecrated to the ransom of India to leave unattempted the execution of Coke's great scheme. They advanced with an intrepid step to grapple with the giant idolatry of that ancient nation, and thus was prepared the way for those stupendous achievements of which India has since been the theater.

But as our history shows, the death of this ubiquitous missionary not only did not defeat the well-devised mission in the East, but, while it struck the knell through the Church, "it was a summons to the Church to rise universally and march round

the world." His personal agency, which, in its single unaided efforts, seemed almost adequate to the demands of missions, had now ceased. The painful consciousness of this stirred the leading minds of the Connection to their depth, and the conferences arose as a unit to supply this service. The movement was so profound as to thrill the Protestantism of Europe, which now struck for the universal evangelization of the nations. This spirit became pervasive and dominant, especially in the dissenting Churches, and was destined thenceforth to shape and emblazon their history. Forthwith arose in rapid succession the great missionary associations of the age. First appeared the Baptist Society, (1792,) then the Scottish Society, (1796,) and then the London Missionary Society, (1795,) which Dr. Stevens has traced directly to Methodism in its Calvinistic form. Of the many millions poured through these channels into the missionary treasury, the Wesleyans alone, in half a century, contributed more than seventeen millions of dollars.

Thus this great revival of the eighteenth century has given the strongest attestation of its vital force in the missionary efficacy it has displayed. The vital spirit which it breathed on those self-sacrificing hundreds who have sublimely expatriated themselves to kindle heavenly hope in barbarous climes, could not be diverse from that which fell in tongues of fire on the pentecostal ministers. Those, like these, surmounted obstacles the most formidable. Wealth and wisdom, pride and prejudice, power and policy, hate and superstition, all gave way before these anointed heralds.

For six years succeeding 1821 the mission field amazingly expanded; an island or a group of islands were annually added to it. But in almost every instance the heavenly work was inaugurated under a storm of persecution; still, ascendancy was gained under its severest peltings. Their persons, their chapels, the entire circles of their interests, were often periled by the fury of the mob. But amid all these perils the stream of Gospel influence swelled and rolled on with accumulating power till no resistance could arrest it; so that in less than twenty years they were in the midst of scenes resembling apostolic triumphs among ancient pagans, who cast their idols to the bats and their books to the flames. Indeed, the achievements made by new-born Christianity were again repeated on these dark islands of the ocean.

Our history has not ignored the effect on the great emancipation struggle which was exerted by this moral change of those enslaved pagans. It stirred many a noble heart in England to toil for their disenthralment. In 1807 the friends of the black man saw the end of the slave-trade, and twenty-seven years later they triumphed in the freedom of the colonies. Now ceased forever the tarring and feathering and imprisoning and vexing the heroic missionaries. The last day of slavery had come, and thrilling were the events that closed the dark history of human chattelism on these islands. Eight hundred thousand slaves crowded round the altars of religion. The light of freedom should dawn on them in the temple of God. The midnight hour saw them on their knees; the clock struck the eventful hour, and rung out freedom to almost a million of slaves. They arose unfettered by the chains in which they were born, and through the midnight heavens they rolled the notes of thanksgiving, uttering, like the sound of many waters,

Praise God, from whom all blessings flow.

But we must hasten to notice by a single glance the last act in the great drama which is depicted in the closing chapters of this interesting volume. This consisted in what signalized the "Centenary of Methodism." Our author having looked with scrutiny into those events which are supposed to have inaugurated Methodism, justifies the Connection in determining the thirty-ninth year of the last century as its birthtime. That such an era in the history of Protestantism should glide away with the undistinguished past was regarded ungrateful to Providence. To commemorate it by monuments significant of its sublime character was therefore resolutely determined. The aim was not merely retrospective—to recall the divine interferences in the progress of the movement; but also prospective—to promote the far-reaching interests now committed to the Connection. It was not "the boastful jubilation of a successful set," but a profound expression of felt obligation to the living Head of the Church. This was made chiefly not by the fervid expressions of the lips, but by the unequivocal utterances of *action*; by princely contributions to the noblest of great objects.

Though the determination of the conference was to make

the primary object of the jubilee the pious advancement of the societies, still the "Centenary" subserved to an amazing extent the enlargement of their institutions. Our historian portrays with vision-like power the preparatory steps to this grand ovation. The picture which he draws, for instance, of the Manchester meeting in the preceding year opens the thrilling scene before your very eyes. There you see a galaxy of representative minds through which all the voices of the Connection seemed to have utterance; upon which all the lights that had fallen on the pathway of a century appeared to converge. This proved not to be the transient glow of a happy social hour, but a kindled flame which should pervade England, and, unquenched by the ocean, kindle American Methodism.

Never before did the whole British Connection so compete to swell the great thank-offering to God. The six objects were first determined to which the contributions should be appropriated. They were, 1. The edifices for the two theological institutions. 2. The Centenary Buildings in London—the new mission rooms, and "Mission Ship." 3. The relief of distressed chapels. 4. A better support for worn-out preachers, and for the widows of the deceased. 5. The building of a "Centenary Chapel" in Dublin. 6. And the funds of the education committee.

Most of these objects were vital to the invigoration and expansion of the Connection. All the circuits in the kingdom vied in their munificent offerings for these noble objects. More than seventeen hundred thousand dollars was the aggregate sum contributed by the various Methodist bodies, an amount exceeding the contribution of any Protestant body in the world. The princely character of this offering, almost two millions, was more signal, as it was made in a year of unparalleled commercial depression.

But that which most distinguished the "Centenary" as an era in Methodism was the vast accumulation of its *moral power*. Those large offerings, cast into the treasury, were indications of the depth and extent of the Christian affection which bound in unity the entire Connection. Every donor seemed to inscribe on his contribution the remembrance of some personal benefit or family blessing of which Methodism had been the channel. The English nation for the first time now awoke to the grandeur

of that moral power which had arisen in its midst. Astonishment seized the public mind in view of its mighty workings. At this celebration, all Christendom was thrilled by this unequivocal expression of moral feeling which was literally fathomless; the impetus felt by the Connection from these collected forces of a whole century has not yet expended its power, and may continue to operate through the lapse of another century.

As our aim in this article has been to epitomize some prominent topics in the volume rather than to animadvert on any literary defects in it, we hope that the utility thus secured will compensate for the want of that acumen which is involved in critical discrimination. Nevertheless, it will not be out of harmony with this aim to conclude our review of the volume with two or three critical suggestions on its scientific character.

Never did Gieseler utter a profounder truth than in affirming that "no spiritual phenomena external to ourselves can be correctly understood in a historical way without reproducing them in ourselves." The internal evidence of the history before us strongly indicates that it was written under the influence of this sentiment. Much of the fascination experienced in perusing this volume is referrible to the reproducing power of the writer, by which the great events and actors of the century are placed before us. The want of this talent in a historian would be poorly compensated by pointed wit, bold contrast, or light flashes of original conceptions. Indeed, the rush of great thoughts, which startle by their massiveness, would be a poor substitute for this rare talent in the historian.

It seems to us impossible to read this history without feeling that its author has so deeply communed with its chief subjects as rather to belong to their times than to his own, as to place them again on the great stage, and make them act over again their parts which they had so nobly sustained. The remote is thus made near; the past, present. Instead of a dry aggregation of materials, a record of mere facts, a mass of phenomena unclassified, we have a skillful transfer of connected events and of living actors, made in the blended spirit of religious earnestness and of human sympathy. Nor can we deny to this history acute discernment, accompanied by delicate taste, with corresponding precision of language and fluency of style. But in our view these great excellencies have not precluded all

defects. The facts so exactly stated, so skillfully arranged, and so eloquently appropriated, are not always so illuminated by the torch of philosophy as to show *how* and *why* they thus occurred, and not otherwise. The ties running through intervening events are not always so traced as to detect the vital relation between the near and the remote.

Though facts form the web of history, to skillfully group them is not the chief power of history. Facts alone are barren and voiceless; to have significance they must be traced upward to their efficient causes, and downward to their final causes. Their meaning must be sought not in themselves, but in their vital relations; so that they furnish an index to what preceded them, and to what comes after them; to those influences both immediate and indirect, near and remote. This involves a double development, and involves the two classes of actors, divine and human, God and man; and two opposing principles, evil and good. Without observing this vital connection of events, how can their phenomena be legitimately classified? How can the historian determine whether they have flowed from individual passions, social impulses, or religious instincts? Whether each event be one of that series of which man is causal, or of which God is causal? Whether a given event has only been appropriated by divine agency, as are all events, or has also been *caused* by that agency? He may perceive, indeed, in the very conflict of events the repugnancy of their sources, but without a just assortment of them. How can he avoid confounding the real with the apparent? To preclude this error events of a class must be found morally homogeneous. No mind being constructed to consider anything *alone*, the danger lies not in treating events as *fragments*, but in arranging them in *false* connections.

Of the great law of association, Dr. Stevens has amply availed himself in one direction. In regarding Wesley as the central agency, it was facile tracing the remotest events to their source; grasping the thoughts, motives, and purposes of this master spirit, it was not difficult reaching the forces which operated on his subordinate agencies. The latter, therefore, must be studied in the former, and must be arranged and developed on the same principle. But in the Wesleyan revival the doctor found not only the great actor in the founder of Methodism,

but the central event of the age in the *concentration of the personally pious into one living organism*. This event he found parental to all subordinate events concurring to make this great movement. No mass of events, however huge, under such treatment, will remain chaotic, as this will serve as a clue through the labyrinth. With very slight exceptions, our history avoids the blunder of locating the near for the remote, and of substituting the trivial for the important, and also of finding the chief cause in a single element of the cause. Those, for example, that find the *cause* of the great Methodist movement in the closing of the *church* doors against Wesley, resemble such as refer the reformation of Luther to the wish of the reformer to obtain a wife.

The strictly scientific character which now pervades all classes of researches cannot be withheld from Church history. What is dead is alone—can have nothing to unfold, can make no part of a living system—and should therefore never be obtruded into history to break its thread or mar its symmetry. As nothing can be tested without a rule, and the vitality of this class of events can have no rule out of the Scriptures, to ignore these as the underlying principle is a radical defect. This rule, then, is indispensable, for the double purpose of rejecting the erroneous and accepting the true. Indeed, we maintain that Church history in its utmost depth cannot be fathomed without ultimate reference to God's oracles as its underlying stratum. How, for example, can a key be found to the origin of tendencies, by which successive periods have been distinguished, without a knowledge of the various conceptions of scriptural doctrine? Thus, what rational account would be possible of those stirring events which have immortalized the third and fourth centuries, without an acquaintance with those keenly debated doctrines that were sifted and settled by the first four general councils? Though a mere record of facts is an indispensable element of history, such a narrative alone can never deserve the title of history. Added to this must be that vital tie which binds in unity every part of a living organism, and especially which will connect Church events with Christian doctrines. It is true that equal importance cannot be attached to the formal connection between Methodist history and Methodist doctrine; still we confess, in our view, such

connection more elaborately traced would have much enhanced the value of this history.

A brief but systematical development of Methodist theology in its causal relation to many of the most thrilling events of the great movements, would to many otherwise well-informed readers shed a startling light on the theology of our Church. The period of a century and a quarter has been too brief to convince such that the doctrines of the Methodists are not a series of crude notions too loosely connected to deserve the name of a system. Nor would the catholicity so gracefully exhibited in the history have been *really* less. While this symmetrical system of doctrines would shed its own unborrowed light on the history, it would receive a reflected luster from the great events it had generated; and thus would appear more strikingly the accordance of our theology with the primary intuitions of the soul, and with the most obvious import of the *sacred oracles*. But despite these apparent defects, this work, otherwise executed by a master hand, should be regarded as a priceless contribution to our literature, and as a standard book of its class.

This volume, with the two preceding ones, should not be confined to the minister's library, but should be read wherever the English language is the channel of thought. As we look for a fourth volume of Methodist history from the same able hand, which shall trace the great Wesleyan movement in America, we shall await its appearance with no common solicitude. Signal must be the skill which shall compress into a single volume the huge mass of materials which will crowd on the historian from almost a hundred years of stupendous achievements.

The agency by which Methodism has been developed on this continent is in some regards unique. In part it has passed from the stage, and in part it still survives; while the identity of aim unifies the dead and the living. Great questions, more or less vital to the common cause, have been earnestly discussed. Candor, almost morbid, will be indispensable in the historian to preclude the charge of partiality, to discuss partisan questions free from a partisan spirit. Should the gifted author succeed in this delicate task, the work will be a monument which ages cannot crumble, a book which generations shall read, a living voice of mighty utterances of the Gospel's saving efficacy.

ART. III.—THE TWO GREEK REVOLUTIONS OF 1862.

WHILE upon this western continent we have for months been called to witness the sad loss of human life and destruction of property which a gigantic rebellion has inflicted upon a people that until yesterday had enjoyed a prosperity rarely equaled in the history of the world, and political institutions, the envy of all liberal men, the hand of Providence has not failed to lend us encouragement, in the midst of circumstances so much calculated to depress, by pointing not only to those seasons of severe trial which in the past have visited every nation of importance, but yet more significantly to events occurring in our own times, which must convince us that we are but suffering the common allotment of mankind. The most firmly established of European monarchies have not escaped commotions that seemed to portend more serious conflicts in the future; and the little kingdom of Greece has experienced a civil war which awakened in the minds of the older portion of the population an apprehension of the re-enactment of such scenes of horror as took place thirty or forty years ago, in the days of their youth. In a former article in this Review, little more than a twelvemonth since, we endeavored to convey a correct impression of the present political condition of the Greeks, as the result of their past history, and especially of the policy of the government of Greece during the period that succeeded its revolutionary struggle. We were naturally led to point out some of those dangers which, in our opinion, seemed to threaten the stability of its peace. The record of the past year has lent to our fears the confirmation of fact.

Of dissatisfaction with the administration of Otho there has for a long time been no lack. The glowing expectations founded on his advent to the land of his adoption in the bloom of youth were wholly dissipated years ago. His selfish schemes, as short-sighted as they were permanently injurious to his subjects, disgusted alike, though on very different grounds, the unenlightened peasant and the enthusiastic philhellene. The foreigner came in contact with few persons, in the intercourse he held with the Athenians, who would attempt to uphold the admin-

istration as deserving of respect, or to disguise their dislike of King Otho. The few exceptions were found to consist in general of the *attachés* of the court, or aspirants to offices at the king's disposal. With grief well-nigh amounting to despair, true patriots discovered that when a new cabinet succeeded one that had been overturned in consequence of the disclosure of flagrant malfeasance, or insufferable submission to the arbitrary demands of the sovereign, the new ministers were but the counterparts of their predecessors in everything but name. Nor was their faith in the future confirmed when the new deputies, returned to represent more liberal principles, proved no less open to the influence of the bribes or patronage of the court, so that the king rarely failed to secure a working majority in his favor. Yet popular commotions and abortive attempts at revolution, though frequent, were far less serious than might have been expected; for none were so dull as not readily to perceive that the same powers of Europe which had placed Otho upon the throne could assuredly either secure him in its possession, or supply his place with some other monarch, as much more oppressive as was King Crane than King Log, in the fable.

To the ordinary sources of dissatisfaction, which were of long standing, has of late been added the grievance of an unusual degree of interference with the freedom of the elections, and this of so marked a character as to elicit intimations of disapproval even from foreign governments. When the late Chamber of Deputies convened, it was found that there was not a single member elected by the opposition. The phenomenon was easy of explanation. In Greece the polls are almost uniformly held in the churches. A couple of soldiers posted at the door, on the days of election, gave ready admittance to electors known to be favorable to the administration; while the opposition vainly strove to gain access to the building, and were turned back with the announcement that their names were not upon the register of those entitled to vote. If by any accident the governmental candidate was discovered to be in danger of defeat, the prospect was readily altered by the insertion of additional ballots by the election committee and guard—all being men selected for their known devotion to the crown. To counterbalance this accession of ballots, the names of non-resi-

dents or deceased persons must be inscribed upon the lists; and it was a common report that four thousand dead men voted at Athens alone, all on the ministerial side. No wonder that with a House thus elected, and with senators appointed by the cabinet without any participation of the people in the selection, the most dangerous projects were initiated toward the close of the year 1861. Retrograde governments have always shown the utmost sensitiveness to the criticism of a free press; and the first symptoms of the proximity of revolution are frequently detected in the attempt to fetter its utterances. The new Chambers of Greece had scarcely been organized, before it was rumored that an oppressive bill was to be introduced to regulate the exercise of this new organ of public sentiment. The provision that no person should edit a newspaper who had not acquired the degree of "didactor," or doctor, in one of the schools of the university, was intended to exclude a great part of the present corps of editors. But the additional condition of depositing ten thousand drachms, or nearly seventeen hundred dollars, as caution money, was a manifest violation of the Constitution, which, while it recognizes the pecuniary responsibility of editors and proprietors of public journals, expressly prohibits the exaction of security. It was remarked by one well qualified to judge, that some few of the present corps might perhaps conform to the latter requirement, but that barely two or three were possessed of the necessary qualifications as graduates. "This measure," it was pithily added, "will greatly lighten the labors of the king's attorneys, and especially those of the prosecutor at the capital, since it will put an end to the frequent seizures of papers. It will also free the government from the annoyance of seeing its actions criticised and condemned through the press. Although in the present state of affairs nothing is improbable, yet we incline to believe that the cabinet will give a serious consideration to the consequences of so harsh a measure." The opposition elicited by the mere announcement of the project determined the ministerial party not to bring it publicly forward.

The illiberal character of the legislature was evinced yet more distinctly by the law on mixed marriages, in which the odious provisions of the most bigoted edicts on this vexed question were reproduced. "Marriage between a person belonging

to the Eastern Orthodox (Greek) Church and one belonging to any other Christian religion is valid," says this precious relic of medieval exclusiveness, "when celebrated by a priest of the Eastern Orthodox Church, if all the prescriptions of the Greek law are observed, and if a promise is first made by the bridegroom, in the presence of the justice of the peace (*ειρηνοδίκης*) of the place in which the marriage is performed, that the children that may be born of this marriage shall be baptized and educated in the Eastern Orthodox religion. The violation of this promise is punished according to the 270th article of the Penal Code." Vainly did the friends of religious equality and toleration oppose the law; it was passed by a large majority in spite of the remonstrances of Mr. Cyriacus, representative of the city of Athens, who stigmatized it as repugnant to the spirit of the Constitution, and to the principles of the nineteenth century.

Alarming evidence of the discontent of the people was found about the same time in an attempt made by a young student named Dosios to assassinate the Queen Amelia, then regent, during the absence of her husband. The queen fortunately escaped injury, and the would-be murderer was tried and condemned. His counsel endeavored to prove him insane, but the judges took a different view of the case. He himself, at a preliminary examination, boldly avowed his intention of freeing his country from tyranny. Scarcely had the felicitations of ambassadors and high dignitaries, and the special services in the churches in honor of her majesty's deliverance ceased, when a new and equally startling disclosure was made. A conspiracy had been formed to murder the king, who had now returned, and among those implicated were a number of cavalry officers and soldiers. These premonitions could not fail to excite alarm in the breasts of Otho and Amelia, for against insubordination in the native army they had been without defense, since they were compelled in 1843 to dismiss their Bavarian troops.

Notwithstanding these and other tokens of an approaching tempest, the government was unable to obtain any intimations sufficiently definite to enable it to provide against the storm. Information which has of late reached us, but which never found its way into the Athenian press, enables us to assert that an extensive revolution had been organized, far more extensive than the monarch or his counselors ever imagined possible.

The head and heart of the movement was Athens, from which, as a center, it had spread to all parts of the kingdom. In the capital it counted among its adherents many of the most influential citizens, some of whom held high offices in the civil administration, as well as in the army and navy. But although so many were necessarily intrusted with the weighty secret, so perfect was the organization, and so reliable the confidants, that no tidings reached the cabinet. Many a poor Athenian possessed and kept securely the intelligence which the court would have willingly bought at a high price. Vague rumors were indeed current, and the police even ventured to make some arbitrary arrests; but all their search was of no avail. Canaris, an admiral in the Greek navy, was probably the leader of the conspirators. For the outbreak, which was intended to be simultaneous throughout the entire country, a day early in the month of February, 1862, was chosen. On the evening of that day a ball was to be given at the palace, at which the king and queen, the latter an ardent lover of the dance, were to appear in public. At an appointed signal the conspirators, who had posted themselves near the persons of the royal pair, were to advance, and, interrupting their festivities, hurry them off to the port Piræus, whence a steamer in waiting would convey them back to the Germany, which they ought never to have left. The plan was a bold one, and it would probably have been effected without the effusion of blood had not one of those apparently fortuitous circumstances occurred which often disturb the most accurate of human calculations.

An important point in the eyes of the conspirators was the city of Nauplia, situated at the southern end of the rich Argolic plain, sixty miles distant in a direct line from Athens, but nearly twice as far by the circuitous route which a steamer must take in turning the southern cape of the Argolic peninsula. Of no great importance in ancient times, except as the port of the celebrated cities of Mycenæ, Argos, and Tiryns, which, as was customary at an early period, when piracy universally prevailed, were built at a considerable distance from the sea, during the middle ages Nauplia grew at the expense of its neighbors. When Greece revolted from the Turks, Nauplia, called by the Italian sailors Napoli di Romania, was the most important city of the Peloponnesus. When the

claims of various localities to become the permanent capital of the new kingdom were made the subject of debate, there were not a few who advocated the selection of Nauplia, which had served as the temporary seat of government. Nothing but the prestige of Athens prevented the adoption of Nauplia or Corinth for this honorable distinction. Besides its convenient situation for commercial purposes, the city of which we speak possessed a strong fortress, the Palamede, reputed to be the most defensible position in the Peloponnesus, surpassing even the famous Acrocorinthus in this particular, since there are no great elevations in the neighborhood by which it is commanded. The possession of this citadel had indeed made Nauplia the *key* of Southern Greece.

For many years the Palamede has been the arsenal of Greece. At the beginning of 1862 it was said to contain not less than fifty thousand stand of arms. There was a large quantity of ammunition, and all the siege pieces in Greece were to be found within its walls. A great part of the standing army of the kingdom were permanently stationed here to guard the position and its important stores. Three thousand men constituted the garrison at the date above mentioned. Not only the principal officers, but even the subordinates, had entered into the conspiracy; and it has been remarked that none were more faithful than the non-commissioned officers, who on more than one occasion during the subsequent difficulties, detecting infidelity or cowardice in their superiors, locked them in their rooms, that they might have no opportunity to damage the common cause.

The conspirators at Nauplia, in their communications with the leaders at Athens, had been assisted by an agent of the Dutch consulate. Their letters were inclosed by him in envelopes addressed to the consular bureau at the capital, and thus they passed safely through the post-office, protected by the foreign seal from the prying eyes of the salaried spies, whose acquaintance with ordinary letters is reputed to be much too intimate. The Dutch consul himself seems to have been ignorant of the contents of the correspondence that accompanied his dispatches. At length intelligence reached the nomarch of Argolis which satisfied him that letters of a treasonable character would be found in the mail then in the post-office. He at once ordered its detention; and the police officers had

executed his commands, when the agent of the consul revisited the office, suspecting that something was amiss, and requested his dispatches to be returned. Instead of complying with his request the seal was broken, the letters read, and the names of some of the principal leaders at Athens, as well as of their comrades at Nauplia, came to light. The Nauplians saw that there was no time to be lost, if they would consult their own safety. On the first day of February, Old Style, (the thirteenth, New Style,) five or six days before the day previously fixed upon for the common movement, the Hellenic army at Nauplia raised the standard of revolt. Under their commanding officers, Botzaris, Grivas, and Artemes, they at once possessed themselves of the person of the nomarch, who had been instrumental in their discovery, not without some violence. The custom-house and the bank were the first objects of their search, and their contents were speedily applied to the support of the movement. The military prison was visited, and the convicts were not only liberated, but arms were placed in their hands, and they went to swell the number of the insurgents. At the same time the precaution was taken to secure not only the strong fortifications of the citadel, but also the inferior works that protect the lower town in the direction of the suburb of Pronia, and the detached castle of Bourdzi, which stands upon a rock scarcely rising above the sea. So promptly were these measures adopted that if any opposition was entertained by the inhabitants of the city, which with its suburbs may contain eight or nine thousand souls, few ventured to give any expression to their secret feelings.

Meanwhile at Athens the intelligence awakened the deepest solicitude. The king could not view without emotion the establishment of an armed band of rebels in the very city where twenty-nine years before, on the 6th of February, 1833, he had stepped for the first time upon Grecian soil. Apprehensions were entertained lest the insurrection at Nauplia might prove to be only a part of a preconcerted movement extending over the entire country. It was not, therefore, without great relief that telegraphic dispatches from Argos, Patras, Lamia, and other prominent localities, announced the maintenance of good order, and a general repudiation of the attempt of the rebels. At Athens itself quiet ruled, and the citizens

devoted themselves to their usual pursuits, with the exception of a few ever ready to take advantage of any novelty to indulge in idleness. The legislative bodies were summoned to an extraordinary session, and at once took occasion to express in strong terms their condemnation of the revolution, and their readiness to afford the government all needed aid and support. At the same time the government ordered the arrest of fifteen or twenty Athenians of various professions, whose names are given in the Greek journals. They seem subsequently to have been as summarily released; and from this circumstance we may be warranted in inferring that the grounds of their imprisonment were discovered to be frivolous. At least no charge was preferred against them that could be substantiated before a court of law.

As intelligence began to come in from those parts of the kingdom which were in less close communication with the capital, it was found that nowhere had the insurrection manifested itself outside of Nauplia, save in the town of Tripolis, or as it is named upon our maps, Tripolitza, the capital of Arcadia, the central *nome* of Peloponnesus. Here the leaders endeavored to strengthen their cause by giving it the sanction of religion. The Archbishop of Mantinea was induced to take an active part in encouraging the rebels, if indeed he was not originally one of the chief conspirators. Not only did he sprinkle the band with consecrated water, and administer to them the oath of fidelity to one another, but he was so bold as to deliver a sermon or address full of comfort to those who had espoused the desperate cause. Only a few months had elapsed since this prelate had revealed his true character indifferently well. An agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society visiting Arcadia, had felt the liveliest pity for the poor prisoners confined in the jail of Tripolitza, and destitute of religious instruction, as well as of anything to counteract the debasing influence of vicious associates. He therefore distributed among the prisoners a number of Bibles and New Testaments in the modern Greek. On hearing of this benevolent donation, the Archbishop of Mantinea, instead of testifying satisfaction at so Christian an act, exercised his authority as diocesan, and caused the Word of God to be taken away from these poor souls who were famishing for spiritual food. This

heathenish course was violently criticised by thinking men, but it received no notice from the government, which soon after discovered this prelate's unworthiness, as evinced in his abetting the rebellion. But whether the insurgents did not meet in Tripolitza with the support they anticipated, or whether the position was too exposed to be deemed tenable, certain it is that they were compelled, after seizing upon the public treasury, to evacuate the town and retreat in the direction of Sparta and Messenia. Not long after, finding their efforts fruitless, and their number diminished by desertions, they sent for one of the national officers of a village near which they were, and after voluntarily surrendering to him the public property they had seized, quietly dispersed and returned to their homes.

The first military movements of the royal forces seem not to have been attended with much success. A considerable body of infantry and artillery, drawn together from various points, was concentrated near Corinth, and hurried forward to the narrow pass of Dervenakia, where the road from Corinth to the Argolic plain finds its way through the mountain range which further to the east spreads over the entire Argolic peninsula. It was the possession of this difficult pass which in 1822 enabled the Greek patriots to overwhelm the numerous army of Drami Ali Pasha. The royal generals were consequently anxious to become masters of it, and in this attempt they were successful. The Argive to whom the insurgents had intrusted the task of organizing a band and defending the pass proved a coward, and hid himself in a neighboring vineyard, whence he was drawn out and imprisoned by the Nauplians. But on pressing forward the royal army fell into an ambuscade in the immediate vicinity of the ruins of ancient Tiryns. The prospect of the sea-shore is here cut off from the main road by a growth of reeds and other marsh plants. Under cover of these the insurgents had placed floating batteries in a position to command the road; and scarcely had the royal troops made their appearance before the vegetation disappeared, as if by magic, and a murderous fire opened on their flank. The loss of the army from this unexpected attack was reported by the government organs to be two killed and twelve wounded. It was subsequently shown that it ought to have been stated at more than one hundred.

A few weeks elapsed, embracing the latter part of the month of February, during which the operations before Nauplia were unimportant. Indications of feeling unfavorable to the government appeared at Athens, where disturbances took place at the university and the gymnasia, and a number of shopkeepers suddenly closed their shops, alleging that as no business was done it was useless for them to keep them open. The shopkeepers were forced by the police, who saw in the steps adopted some secret design, to reopen their establishments, even if they sold nothing. And the students were punished by the promulgation of an order from the minister of public instruction, suspending the exercises of the institutions for a period of several months, an arrangement by which all but the most industrious were delayed fully one year in their studies. Within a few weeks the gymnasium of Patras was likewise closed, apparently for the same cause. Evidently the government looked with suspicion on the body of students gathered in these institutions, perhaps fearing lest in the bosom of this excitable and enthusiastic class there might arise some more significant movement, giving to the revolution a definite aim and a more lasting impulse. The Athenians were forbidden their customary carnival festivities, for the disguises so essential to the unrestricted license of this season were altogether prohibited. Nor were more than two persons allowed to walk the streets in company. At the same time the influence of the clergy was invoked to restore quiet throughout the land. The "Holy Synod" published an encyclic letter, in which both clergy and laity were enjoined to give due submission and obedience to the king and to the laws of the state.

Meanwhile the rebel leaders, although disappointed at finding that their cause was espoused by few outside of the walls of Nauplia, prepared to make a vigorous resistance to the royal troops, now encamped in the immediate neighborhood, while continuing to kindle the flame of revolt elsewhere. For this purpose they had, at the very commencement of their struggle, addressed to their countrymen a proclamation, now for the first time published by the loyal papers of the realm. The glories attaching to the 25th of March, the anniversary of the outbreak of the revolution which emancipated Greece from Turkish rule, were rehearsed and contrasted with those that belonged

to the 3d of September, 1843, which beheld the establishment of constitutional government. But neither of these critical days was more deserving of everlasting remembrance than the 1st of February, when the country was saved from the suffocating embrace of "a system whose emblem was lawlessness and treason, a system of slavery and degradation." "Heroic Nauplia," added the document in enthusiastic language, "under the leadership of heroes, in conjunction with its brave garrison, and with the full concurrence of the citizens, first seized its arms, and first struck a fatal blow at that system, unfurling the standard of freedom, on which appear, inscribed in golden letters, these three principles capable of saving the nation: 1. The fall of the system hitherto observed, and the proclamation of a new system assuring the freedom of the people, and the application of the two following principles. 2. The dissolution of the present council (Chamber of Deputies) established by violent measures. 3. The convocation of a national convention promising the recovery by the nation of its liberties, which have been trodden under foot, and the fulfillment of all our noble and national longings." This declaration of the objects contemplated by the revolution was signed by eleven of the most prominent leaders, among whom were Zappeiropoulos and Peter Mauromichales. A document accompanied it, in which the authorities of the city of Nauplia indorsed the action of the army, and boasted that the maintenance of good order had been undisturbed, while private rights and property were amply respected.

On the other hand King Otho, on the 17th of February, (March 1, New Style,) made a solemn address to the Greek people. After deploring the treachery of men for whom the sacredness of an oath and the unsullied honor of a soldier ought to have been pledges of fidelity, but who had invited to their native land the most hateful of all anarchy, military license, the Greek monarch states that the needful steps have been taken to bring the revolt to a speedy conclusion. In the midst of such mournful circumstances, nothing could be more consoling than the universal reprobation with which the tidings of rebellion had been met at the hands of all classes of the population. As the king of such a nation, he must express his gratitude and pride. He reminds his subjects that he has identified his fortunes with theirs, since their future is also his

own. It was for their sakes that he left his own land, his parents and other relatives, a quiet and undisturbed life; for he had from the beginning recognized the fact that a noble future was in reserve for Greece. By their conduct the Greeks had shown that, duly estimating these sacrifices, they sought the prosperity of their country only in the exercise of justice and the operation of the Constitution of the realm. He therefore exhorted them to remain steadfast in that mutual confidence in and love of the throne, to which they were indissolubly bound by the oaths of 1833 and 1844. To the address were appended, below the signature of Otho, the names of all the members of the cabinet: Countouriotis, Botsares, Simos, Botles, and Christopoulos. It was everywhere read, and by some its assurances of solicitude for the common welfare were welcomed. The greater number of readers, however, we may well suppose, were not disposed to rate very highly the sacrifices which an unappanaged younger son of the king of Bavaria had made in consenting to accept the regal crown of Greece, and thought perhaps that the profuse expenditures of the palace, when viewed in connection with the neglect of public improvements, failed to confirm that extreme devotion to the national weal of which an exhibition was so ostentatiously made. Others, if disposed to be more censorious, suggested that the repeated reference to civic and military oaths was scarcely seemly in the mouth of a monarch whose entire policy had been an undisguised hostility toward the form of government he had solemnly sworn to uphold.

A royal ordinance, published two days before the address, promised amnesty to all soldiers who, previous to the commencement of the actual bombardment of Nauplia, should lay down their arms. It was also extended to non-commissioned officers who could prove that their participation in the revolt had been compulsory or the result of no premeditation. What was the effect of the proclamation does not appear. Indeed, the universal complaint of the press was that the public was kept in ignorance of events that were transpiring in and around Nauplia.

At length, everything having been made ready for an assault on the positions held by the rebels, a general attack was made on the 1st of March, just one month after the outbreak of the rebellion. On all points the attack was successful, although

the advantage was not gained without great effusion of blood. First the little hamlet of Areia was carried, a position two miles eastward of Nauplia, on the same rocky ridge, the possession of which was of great importance, as it contains the springs whence the water is brought by an aqueduct to the city. A height crowned by a mill known as that of Tambacopoulos was taken about the same time. Next the assailants directed their efforts against the suburb of Pronia, close to the gates of the city. Here a more determined resistance was experienced, but before the close of the day Pronia was added to the positions that remained in the hands of the royal troops. In these several engagements a considerable number of prisoners were taken, among whom were several officers, Lieut. Gourgoures, Coronæus, and others. Six cannon and some ammunition also fell into the hands of the royalists. But the victory was purchased at a costly sacrifice of life. Five or six hundred were counted among the fallen. The attack had been skillfully planned and faithfully executed by the commanding general, Chan. This prominent philhellene, a Swiss by birth, who after serving in the revolution had settled in Greece, and risen to the rank of major-general in the Greek army, had been ordered by Otho to undertake the suppression of the rebellion. At first he declined the odious task, alleging that it was for no such purposes that he had come to the land of his adoption. But the king assumed the responsibility, and reminded him of that subordination which is the first of military virtues. With great reluctance the general yielded; but at the conclusion of the campaign he retired from a country where he had been made the unwilling instrument of the shedding of the blood of citizens by citizens, and betook himself once more to his native hills.

Notwithstanding this great success, but little progress had been made toward the reduction of Nauplia. It is true that it was now invested both by land and sea; but the fortress was almost impregnable, and, what was of more consequence, the insurgents had an abundance of artillery and ammunition, while the royalists were altogether unprovided with siege pieces, all that the government owned having fallen into the possession of the rebels, together with the arsenal. It was evident that Nauplia could be gained for the royal cause only by a long and tedious blockade or by surrender on advantageous terms. A

truce for five days was agreed upon between the garrison of Nauplia and the besieging force, and this was the end of active operations. At the termination of this truce a new truce followed, and then a series of armistices were entered into.

Meanwhile another insurrection, or rather another part of the same general plan of revolt which had been disconcerted by the premature disclosure of the plot and outbreak at Nauplia, revealed itself among the Cyclades. The small garrison of Syra or Hermoupolis, the most important commercial port of Greece, raised the standard of the revolution about the first day of March, (Old Style.) The local government indorsed the movement, but afterward disowned its action, as having been the result of constraint. The soldiers, numbering about one hundred and fifty men, seized one of the best vessels belonging to the Greek steamship company, and steamed first to the island of Tenos, where, after a delay which eventually proved fatal to their cause, they took on board another small detachment of troops animated by the same sentiments. They were under the command of a skillful officer, Leoutzakos by name, who in 1854 had been governor of Lamia, and had twice defeated the Turks in the plains of Thessaly. It was his plan, after gathering all the troops whom he could muster on the islands of the *Ægean*, to sail to Chaleis, on the island of Eubœa. Having released all the prisoners in the public prison, and thus swelled his force, he was to cross the bridge to the mainland and march through Bœotia, or transport himself and his followers to Marathon and take a more direct route to Athens, where his confederates awaited him, ready to take up arms at his approach. But the want of readiness of the *Teniot*s delayed the steamer so long that scarcely had it reached the island of Cythnus, its next stopping place, when the royal corvette "*Amalia*" made its appearance in pursuit. As it arrived Leoutzakos, who had hastily thrown up a breastwork on the shore, and might easily have destroyed the royalists in their open boats, ordered his soldiers not to fire, and made signals of his desire to address the approaching party. He was standing on the breastwork about to speak, when Chrysoverges and Tsiros, in command of the royalists, ordered their men to fire. Leoutzakos fell pierced with several balls; many of his followers shared his fate, the rest were made prisoners, and the plan failed. The brutal

Chrysoverges expressed his unwillingness to give the corpse of the fallen officer a place on the *Amalia* as it returned to Athens. Placed, naked, we believe, in a little open boat, it was trailed after the steamer, while the insolent victors vented upon the dead man their reproaches and contumely. The commandant had even the hardihood to boast at Athens of the exploit, and nearly paid the price of his audacity; for a relative of Leoutsakos attempted to avenge his murder, and was only hindered by the interference of other persons who happened to be present. And even after the flames of civil war had been extinguished, when Chrysoverges had occasion to land at Nauplia, for the purpose of visiting friends at Argos, he was met at the wharf by an indignant crowd of three thousand persons, who hissed and cursed him as a murderer, and pelted him with the most disgusting substances. Not a carriage driver would consent to carry him to Argos; with difficulty could he find a seat in a rough cart.

The time for an accommodation was now evidently drawing nigh. On the one hand, the insurgents had beheld the failure of their attempts to elicit the co-operation of the other portions of Greece. A new effort might be crowned with success, if carefully planned and executed simultaneously throughout the country; but the failure of the present undertaking was inevitable. On the other hand, the government had no means for the reduction of Nauplia, and could afford to purchase the submission of the rebels at the cost of a few concessions. The terms of the proclamation of amnesty were gradually extended by announcements issued during the latter part of the month of March. Many of the families of Nauplia were allowed by both parties to leave the rebel lines. Finally the insurgents consented to surrender the place on condition that the amnesty should be extended to all excepting certain leaders, a list of whose names was made; and the government pledged itself to the foreign ambassadors to carry into effect those reforms which the Nauplians had demanded in their programme. On this basis an agreement was made; and on Easter Sunday, April 8, Old Style, (20th, New Style,) 1862, the rebellion, which had lasted nearly seventy days, was terminated. The leaders, and many of their followers, embarked on an English and a French steamer that lay waiting for them in the Argolic gulf, and soon

reached Smyrna. Three of their number, among them the coward who had been appointed to guard the pass of Dervenakia, being in disagreement with their comrades, proceeded from Smyrna to Italy. The royal troops re-entered Nauplia through those ancient and curious gates on whose portals is yet to be seen the winged lion of St. Mark's, the emblem of the former supremacy of the Venetian republic. The blockade of the Argolic gulf was removed. The tidings of the restoration of peace were carried to every part of Europe on the telegraphic wires, and the congratulations of the Lord Commissioner of the Ionian Isles and of other rulers came back in quick response.

A wise monarch and cabinet would have viewed such an opportunity as that now presented as one of those critical junctures which, if improved, may lead to firm and solid peace, but which, neglected, are forever irretrievably lost. The rebellion had made a clear and unmistakable revelation of the extent of the prevailing discontent. No class of the population were free from dissatisfaction. Even the soldiery, upon whom Otho had reposed unquestioning confidence, had proved disaffected. They had been ringleaders in the revolt. Nor were the causes which had led to the revolt disguised. The government had been distinctly informed that it was the deliberate ignoring of the people, the attempt to deprive the public of all participation in the affairs of state, the utter disregard of constitutional prescriptions and of the common welfare, which had alienated the great mass of the Greek people. And the lesson which the revolution was intended to communicate ought to have been no less salutary, because of its failure through a want of concert among its originators. It would have been easy for the monarch, by the adoption of wise and sufficiently radical reforms, to have precluded the possibility of a repetition of the attempt, and to have acquired such a hold upon the affections of his people as might have secured his crown to his successors for several generations. None of his previous derelictions—the sad record of nearly an entire generation—would have dimmed his future glory; so forgiving is the people whom recent favors blind to ancient wrongs. Was this the record of the Bavarian Otho?

The king in his boyhood had been intended for a cardinal of the Roman Church. A casual suggestion, and the election

by the protecting powers of Europe, diverted him from an ecclesiastical career, and he exchanged the prospect of a crimson cap for the reality of a regal crown. But the principles which Jesuit tutors had inculcated he could never forget. It was no intention of his to fulfill the promises of reform which he had made; and the proofs of this were soon to be seen.

The revolution had exhibited the paramount necessity of the organization of a national guard. The legislative bodies were summoned to take this matter into consideration, and after several postponements of the opening of their sessions, they commenced their deliberations. Meanwhile the ministry of Miaoulis fell; and after the portfolio had been offered to Mr. Tricoupis, whose demands the king could not bring himself to admit, Mr. Colocotronis, formerly master of ceremonies, was intrusted with the formation of a new cabinet. How general and how thorough was the detestation in which the outgoing ministers were held, may be inferred from a single incident. The Minister of Justice and Education, Mr. Potles, a person of gentlemanly manners and pleasing address, had been a lawyer before taking his seat in the cabinet. No sooner was his resignation of office tendered, than the Athenian association of lawyers expelled him from their society. Similar marks of disapproval awaited other tools of the king.

In the Chamber of Deputies the law respecting the new National Guard was made the subject of violent discussion. On the one hand, all true patriots endeavored to secure to the members of the guard themselves the selection of all the officers. On the other hand, the party which was headed by both the late and the present ministers proposed to place the unrestricted right of nominating them in the hands of the king. Finally there was a partial compromise adopted, which provided that from four candidates elected by the guard the king should select one. The determination of the government to secure the passage of the bill we cannot but regard as most ill-advised. It convinced the people that Otho was determined to be guided, as heretofore, by a policy dictated by Austria and Bavaria; a policy that denied to the people all control of the military, as well as of the civil administration. For could not the king always count upon finding at least one out of the four candidates entirely subservient to his purposes? "The Cham-

ber of Deputies of Greece," said one journal, "has thus, in open day, granted to the executive a right belonging exclusively to the people. We devoutly pray that this instrument may never be turned against the people itself, from whose hands it has been so dextrously snatched." As a matter of necessity the bill, which had passed the lower House, was hurried through the Senate, composed of the nominees of the king, and in August the law was formally signed by Otho. At that very moment the Minister of Justice, Mr. Eliopoulos, chose to give a new token of his zeal to outdo all previous ministers in devotion to the "system," under which term the Athenians have been wont of late to designate the unconstitutional and retrograde tendencies of the partisans of the court. He gave to the police and other authorities of justice the power of unsealing and reading the private letters sent through the mail, an act expressly forbidden by the Constitution. But this was a draught too bitter even for the Senate, which had so promptly swallowed the law on the National Guard. A violent discussion ensued, and the minister was compelled to admit the illegality of his instructions, with the secret intention, we have no doubt, of nevertheless carrying them more privately into practice, and the Senate entered upon its records this minute: "Whereas the Minister of Justice has publicly acknowledged that the document No. 5,295, of June 30 of the present year, has no official force, and conveys no obligation for its application, the Senate, satisfied with this confession, ceases from all further discussion."

We come now to a fresh scene in the revolutionary drama. Quiet had for months been restored throughout the kingdom. The civil commotions, like angry waves after the tempest has ceased, had gradually subsided, and a season of undisturbed calm seemed about to succeed. So at least thought the court, for the king and queen regarded it as a favorable opportunity for making a pleasure trip, and at the same time conciliating favor by visiting some of the provincial cities. On Wednesday, the 3d of October, Old Style, (15th, New Style,) the royal party left Piræus in the steamer "Amalia," intending to touch at various points on the coast of Peloponnesus, as well as at some of the islands. They carried with them, it is said, not a few ecclesiastical ornaments, intended as presents for the churches they

might visit. They had not been absent many days before important intelligence reached them, as the "*Amalia*" lay before Calamata in the Messenian gulf. On Monday, the 7th of October, the news of a fresh insurrection was received at Athens. It had broken out in the garrison at Bonitza in Acarnania, a town on the Ambracian gulf, and, therefore, in the extreme west of continental Greece. In rapid succession came telegrams announcing its spread to Missilonghi, and along both shores of the Corinthian gulf. On Wednesday the 10th, (22d, New Style,) it was known by all the initiated that the outbreak was to take place in the capital. But the day passed quietly away, and it was not until an hour before midnight that the signal was given by the firing of a musket. Soon the city was in commotion; bodies of armed citizens appeared in all the streets. They massed in the public squares, especially that in front of the palace, where the garrison of probably about three thousand men were called out to oppose them. At first no symptom of disaffection appeared among the troops; they were only waiting to be convinced that the movement was conducted by competent leaders. Most of the fighting took place in the vicinity of the Polytechnic School, and on the street of *Æolus*, one of the chief thoroughfares. But few were killed; it is said three of the gendarmes and two of the citizens. The gendarmes were the only troops that remained steadfast. A spectator thus describes the concluding scene, when the troops began to yield to the popular movement: "Almost the entire garrison of Athens was quartered in the square before Mr. —'s house, and as I was very anxious to be an eye-witness of part of the affair at least, I spent the night at his house, looking down upon the scene below me from one of the windows. It was capital fun to see a portion of the troops scamper off and join the citizens about one o'clock in the morning, which was followed by great cheering in the neighborhood of the royal stables. In half an hour's time after this event there was not a man left on the square; cavalry, infantry, and artillery, all were gone! The gendarmes, seeing that all was over, took refuge in the palace, where they remained till morning, and then surrendered."

The revolution was successful. Country and capital had risen and shaken off the yoke of slavery. Nothing remained

but for the ministry of Colocotronis to resign, which they did the same morning at about two o'clock. Meanwhile the insurgents had not waited for that event, but had at once published the following document :

DECREE.

The sufferings of our native land have ceased. All the provinces and the capital, in union with the army, have put an end to them. As the common determination of the entire Greek nation, it is announced and decreed :

The kingly rule of Otho is annulled. The regency of Amelia is annulled. A provisional government, to govern the realm until the convocation of the National Assembly is established, consisting of the following citizens : Demetrius Boulgares, President ; Constantine Canares and Benizelos Roufos.

A national assembly will be called immediately for the formation of the form of government and the choice of a ruler. *Vive the nation ! Vive the fatherland !*

Done in the year of salvation 1862, the tenth day of October.

This decree was prefaced in the public prints by such editorial expressions as these : "Fellow-citizens ! after a thirty years' contest, and after the greatest sacrifices, the Greek nation has arisen against the tyranny of the Bavarian, Otho Witeltsbach, and is now free !"

The king and queen, informed of the revolt at Bonitza and of its spread through western Greece, had turned their faces homeward. But the overthrow of the government had been effected before they reached Athens. Finding Piræus in the hands of the people, the "Amalia" dropped down toward Salamis ; but on hearing further details regarding the complete success of the revolution, the king gave orders to leave the anchorage. Meanwhile the very officers and sailors of the sole vessel at the king's command had been infected with the prevailing contagion. The firemen had extinguished the fire ; the engineers declared the machinery to be out of order. There was no alternative left but surrender, or escape to some friendly ship. Reluctantly the royal family embraced the latter course. "The tyrant and blood-stained Otho, with his abominable wife Amelia, embarked, weeping and wailing like children, in the English steamer *Scylla*." Such was the language in which the outraged public expressed its long pent-up indignation at the wrongs it had suffered. At nine o'clock in the evening of October 12th,

(24th, New Style,) 1862, the late king, with his consort, was on his way for Trieste, there to resign the crown in favor of his younger brother.

The change had been effected with little bloodshed. It was a providential circumstance that the king and queen were absent on their tour around Peloponnesus; for the plan of the revolution had been formed irrespective of their movements, and had they been in Athens we can well imagine that the issue might have been much more sanguinary. No one had dreamed that the detestation of the people for the late monarch was so general. All joined in the execrations of his memory. The busts and statues which had been so lavishly erected in the squares and gardens were thrown down. The king's crown was destroyed. Even the names of streets and buildings, which recalled his rule, were summarily changed. *The University of Otho* became the *Grecian University*. The palace, it was suggested, must be converted into a great national museum.* The police, the instruments of tyranny, were disbanded, and their places were assumed by a home guard, consisting chiefly or exclusively of students. Their services were needed. Some miscreants, taking advantage of the general confusion, broke into houses during the night of the ensuing Friday. They were caught after a determined resistance, and *eight* were sentenced to be shot at four o'clock on the next day upon the public square of *Concord*, the late square of *Otho*.

The new provisional government was speedily organized, and in the presence of the new metropolitan of Athens swore to consult the interests of the Greek people. It was headed by a man whose antecedents rendered him deserving of the position. Boulgares was a faithful and consistent friend of liberty, a worthy compeer of the aged Mavrocordatos and of Tricoupes. He had, only a few weeks before, introduced into the Senate,

* Among other tokens of the universal desire of all classes of the population to destroy every trace of their late servitude, not the least amusing was the wish of those unfortunate individuals who had hitherto borne the name of Otho to divest themselves of the unpatriotic appellation. In a note addressed to the editor of a journal of the 3d of November, Mr. Catsoulieros says: "I beg you to insert in your next number, for the information of my friends, that having heretofore borne the name of Otho, I now change it to Odysseus, (Ulysses.) I accordingly announce that I shall allow no one to address me by my former name, which recalls to the heart of every Greek years of base slavery and tyranny."

and spoken in favor of a petition from Greeks of Galatz, in Moldavia, praying for a change in the policy of the government, and after a violent debate had secured its insertion in the records of that branch of the legislature. He selected as his cabinet: T. Manghinas, Th. A. Zaimes, A. Coumoundouros, D. Mavromichales, E. Delegeorges, D. Calliphronas, B. Nicolopoulos, and A. Diamantopoulos; filling respectively the departments of Finance, Interior, Justice, War, Public Instruction, Navy, Ecclesiastical, and Foreign Affairs. These gentlemen followed the example of the provisional government in taking a solemn oath to support the laws of the realm and the provisional government, and conscientiously to fulfill their duties. The selection of ministers was not unexceptionable. It is to be regretted that some of the nominees were men destitute of the requisite attainments; while against Mr. Nicolopoulos, placed at the head of the department of religion, can be urged the unpardonable offense against justice, of having been the presiding judge in the iniquitous trial of Rev. Jonas King, D.D., in 1852. Of one whose entire deportment on that occasion was dictated by fanaticism or worse motives; whose examination of witnesses was by no means impartial; whose verdict was in flagrant defiance of the entire testimony, and who added to all a falsification of the record of the case, it cannot be expected that he will carry liberal sentiments into his new and responsible office.

With the successful establishment of the provisional government, the history of the revolution properly ends. An unworthy monarch, who for nearly thirty years had abused the trust reposed in him by those who elected him to sway the destinies of Greece, who squandered on his own pleasures, or laid up for his future use, the scanty revenues of a nation just emerging from an exhausting war of independence, who not only neglected public improvements, but systematically corrupted all upon whom the court could exert an influence, was at last, after eight or nine unavailing insurrections, driven ignominiously from the land. The mendacious proclamation which he wrote from Salamis, attributing his retirement to Germany to his desire to avoid the effusion of blood, and, in an excess of effrontery, asserting that "abstaining from all display, he had cared only for the true interests of Greece, seeking with all his

power to advance its material and moral development, and giving especial study to the impartial administration of justice," was received with contempt by those who knew that no words could have given a more false description of his whole life.

Meanwhile the entire population of Greece seemed to unite in a common pæan for the triumph of its liberties. The exiled heroes of Nauplia, who had resisted single-handed the generals of Otho, returned from their wanderings, and were received with acclamations by the excitable populace. Coronæus, especially, was the object of a popular ovation. On the other hand, Botzares, Potles, and Simos, members of the Miaoules ministry, which had rendered itself peculiarly obnoxious, were bidden by the government to leave the country; and Spiro-Melios and Colocotronis, of the last ministry, received a similar order. In taking this course, the government merely adopted a measure of necessity in the critical posture of affairs. It was sad that among the names of such "dangerous citizens" should be found that of the unworthy son of that Marco Botzares whom the verses of our own Halleck have immortalized.

The personal effects of the deposed monarch were delivered by the Greeks to the ambassador of Bavaria, appointed by Otho to receive them; but they, very properly, refused to allow him to remove the correspondence of that prince, regarding it as an important source of information respecting the means employed for the degradation of Greece. They declined even the proposition to allow it to be placed under seal.

The joy of the inhabitants of Greece was shared in equal measure by all those of the same race in the Ionian Isles, in Turkey, in southern Russia, in Austria, and in western Europe; but the most signal instances of self-denial in behalf of the fatherland were exhibited by the natives of the late kingdom. All classes showed the greatest alacrity in offering a portion of their property to relieve the necessities of the new government. The judges of the Court of Areopagus, the highest tribunal in Greece, the officials connected with the navy department, the professors of the University, and some ecclesiastics, are particularly mentioned as having voluntarily come forward to devote a part (generally the third or quarter) of their income to the support of the country.

But here we must terminate our sketch of the two Greek

revolutions of 1862. The Bavarian dynasty, so inauspicious to the happiness of Greece, has been deposed, never, as we may hope, again to curse that land. Will the experience of the last thirty years satisfy the great powers of Europe of the impracticability of all attempts to impose on the Greeks a monarch of their selection, however badly qualified to perform the most difficult of all tasks, that of elevating a nation long debased by the oppression of tyrannical rulers? Will they suffer the million of Greeks to choose Prince Alfred of England, or the Duke of Leuchtenberg, as they see fit? Or will they once more override the clearly-expressed wishes of a people which ought to be free, if the shedding of torrents of blood in the holy cause of liberty can entitle a nation to that privilege? On the answer of the question depends the future of Greece. God grant that it may not be her sad lot to be subjected to an ignorant, bigoted, illiberal prince, blind to the interests of his subjects, deaf to their remonstrances, insensible to their sufferings, and intent only upon maintaining his power by a series of temporary expedients, and upon the accumulation of private wealth. Then will there be a wide door open for intellectual and moral progress, and Greece may become the instrument in the hand of an all-wise Providence of furthering the advance of pure Christianity in the East.

ART. IV.—ROWLAND HILL.

ABOUT nine miles south of Whitchurch, a handsome market town in Shropshire, England, is the beautiful Hawkstone Park, for many years the residence of the ancient and honorable family of the Hills. The mansion is elegant and spacious, and the surroundings are of the most picturesque character, nature and art combining to delight the eye and to gratify the taste. A celebrated foreign traveler regarded it as one of the most attractive places he had visited in all his wanderings. Dr. Johnson was particularly struck with its wild beauty. In his peculiar style he calls it "a region abounding with striking scenes and terrific grandeur." "The ideas which it forces on

the mind are the sublime, the dreadful, and the vast ; above is inaccessible altitude, below is horrible profundity."

Great as were the honors bestowed on the illustrious family residing here, a higher dignity was conferred upon it when God commissioned one of its members as a minister of Jesus Christ. The year 1744, memorable in the history of Methodism for the meeting of the first Wesleyan Conference, was that in which, on the 23d of August, Rowland Hill was born. We put these two events together, as they serve to show the long term of years over which Mr. Wesley's labors extended. One, who became an active colaborer in the work of promoting evangelical religion, and at the same time a most violent theological opponent, was not born until the Wesleyan Reformation had so far advanced, that its workers were duly organized as a body of Christian ministers.

Though the parents of Rowland Hill were strictly moral, and regular church goers, they do not seem to have known anything of experimental piety. His first religious impressions were produced by reading Watts's hymns. These were deepened by the admonitions of his brother Richard and his sister Jane ; so that at the age of eighteen he experienced the new birth, and entered into his Master's "sweet service," as he frequently termed it. He was at this time a student at Eton, and though surrounded by wild and wicked young men, he hesitated not to make a bold avowal of his faith in Christ. This faithfulness at the beginning of his religious life greatly strengthened his heart, and prepared him to withstand the still fiercer onsets of persecution which he met when, six years later, he entered St. John's College, Cambridge. Here he was so despised for his piety that no one connected with the college gave him a cordial smile, save a few God-fearing students, and the old shoeblack at the gate, who was himself an humble follower of Christ. He united himself with these praying students, and met with them statedly for purposes of devotion. Thus they encouraged each other's hearts amid the depravity around them. This company of faithful ones was similar to the little band which, under the guidance of Mr. Wesley, had met thirty-five years before in Oxford. Mr. Hill tells us of the plan they pursued : "Our custom was to read with each other the Greek Testament and other evangelical publications ; these

meetings we always concluded with prayer. The University was almost in total darkness. No wonder, therefore, if for such exercises, and for some other strong symptoms of a *Methodistical bias*, we were specially marked, and had the honor of being pointed at as the curiosities of the day."

It was while Hill was at Cambridge that six young men were expelled from St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, "for holding Methodistical tenets, and taking upon them to read, pray, and expound the Scriptures, and sing hymns in a private house." The Rev. Dr. Dixon, the principal of the college, used all his influence in favor of these young men, but without success; whereupon he observed, that "as these six young gentlemen were expelled for having too much religion, it would be very proper to inquire into the conduct of some who had too little." We are not told, however, that any such inquiry was instituted. Probably in the estimation of these Oxford pharisees it was a greater sin to sing and pray in an unorthodox, irregular manner, than to be addicted to swearing, drinking, or gambling. Like their prototypes in the days of Christ, they paid "tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin," but "omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith."

This unrighteous act made no little stir, both at Oxford and Cambridge, and called forth the condemnation of all right-minded men. The little band at Cambridge deeply sympathized with their persecuted brethren of Oxford, and wrote letters of encouragement to them in their fiery trial. Newspaper and pamphlet controversies also sprang up, in which Dr. Nowell and Richard Hill were the principal combatants. It was at this time that the latter wrote his "*Pietas Oxoniensis*." Mr. Whitefield likewise addressed a letter to Dr. Durell, Vice-Chancellor of the University, in which he most pertinently inquired "why, if some are expelled for extempore *praying*, are not some others expelled for extempore *swearing*!"

Had the same severity been used at Cambridge, Rowland Hill would have shared a fate similar to that of his Oxford friends, for he was not by any means disposed to hide his light under a bushel. He not only met with his pious fellow-students for devotional exercises, but long before he left college he began preaching in cottages, jails, and work-houses. For this he was violently opposed by his parents, who deemed such

conduct irregular in the extreme. But he could not be disobedient to the plain calls of duty, and so continued preaching wherever the way was opened. He also met with much opposition from the students, and brought upon himself the serious displeasure of the authorities of the college, who threatened to withhold his degree. Under these circumstances, he wrote for advice to Whitefield, who was then in London. Whitefield returned him a kind answer, recounting some of his own persecutions when in a similar situation in Oxford, and exhorting him to steadfastness in the course he had begun. This was the commencement of a warm friendship between the young student and the veteran preacher, which only terminated with the death of the latter, four years after.

Being thus encouraged he continued preaching, bravely withstanding the storm of opposition which was raised against him. But a new difficulty soon arose. He received his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1769; but when, soon after graduating, he applied for deacon's orders, such was the prejudice against him on the part of the Church dignitaries, by reason of his irregular proceedings, that he was pointedly refused. Six different times did he make application for this formal commission of the Church, meeting only with denial from six different bishops. But these unkind refusals neither damped his ardor nor diminished his zeal. As he could not obtain orders, he determined to continue preaching without them. He felt that he had a divine call to his Master's work, and he gave evidence to the world that he had the anointing of the Spirit, without which, the laying on of hands confers no real power. He began a course of itinerating labors in different parts of the kingdom, preaching often in the great cities with wonderful popularity and marked effect. He was especially popular with Mr. Whitefield's congregations at the Tabernacle and Tottenham Court Chapel. Here immense numbers waited on his ministry, and it was the general wish of the people that he should become the successor of their departed pastor. But he could not see his way clear to comply with this flattering request.

He also traveled extensively through the rural districts. A friendly clergyman presented him with a little Welsh pony, which became his companion in many of his most difficult

journeys. As in the city, so among the hills and vales, Mr. Hill drew crowds of people by the charms of his eloquence. He did not, however, escape the usual fate of the faithful preachers of that day; he was persecuted in every possible way. His services were frequently interrupted by rude men, who made all the noise possible by shouting hideously, beating shovels and pans, blowing horns, and ringing bells. He was pelted with eggs, stoned, lampooned, and burned in effigy. Besides, he often suffered the inconveniences of poverty. He had no resources independent of his father, and such was Sir Rowland's bitter enmity to the course of his son that he allowed him only a small annual pittance, so that the faithful itinerant was often without a shilling in his pocket. But God cared for him, and he found compensation for the loss of parental sympathy in the society of such men as Berridge, Romaine, Venn, Conyers, Fletcher, Toplady, and John Newton, and always found a warm welcome at Bath in the house of Lady Huntingdon, which for some time he made his headquarters.

At length, after four years' patient waiting in the ante-chamber of the Church, the door was opened, and he was duly admitted to the ministry by the Bishop of Bath and Wells, who ordained him deacon in 1773. He never succeeded, however, in obtaining priest's orders. The Bishop of Carlisle promised to bestow them, but the archbishop of the province interfered, and issued an order that Hill should receive no further grade in the Church "on account of his perpetual irregularity." He was thus, by the bigotry of the Church authorities, compelled to halt all through his ministry, "wearing only one ecclesiastical boot."

Upon his ordination he was appointed curate of Kingston, a spot interesting in Methodistic history as the place where Wesley and Coke first met. In one respect, at least, it resembled the "sweet Auburn" of Goldsmith, for the salary of the poor parson was "only forty pounds a year." In addition to this, he was, the same year, appointed chaplain to the Countess of Chesterfield. He remained in Kingston only about a year, during which time his labors were greatly blessed. He then preached for a while near Hawkstone, his native place. But here he met with continued opposition from his parents, so

that he found his own home "a furnace indeed." His mother's opposition to his course was especially violent. Lady Huntingdon, who felt a deep interest in his success, interceded for him, but in vain. Neither Sir Rowland nor Lady Hill answered any of her letters on the subject.

He left Hawkstone and built a house and a chapel, which he called the Tabernacle, in Wotton-under-Edge, one of the most romantic and beautiful spots in Gloucestershire. This became to him what Antioch was to Paul, a starting point for his missionary journeys. He traveled far and wide, preaching in town and in country, accompanied, in many of his journeys, by his beloved wife, to whom he had been married shortly before his ordination, and who was a fit companion for a minister of Christ.

Mr. Hill continued these itinerating labors until 1782, in which year he conceived the plan of erecting a chapel in London. Many of those who had profited by his preaching in the metropolis desired to have him located among them; and some of them, who were men of substance, were willing to contribute liberally to the erection of a house of worship. His choice of a field of labor was characteristic of the man. He sought not to obtain a settlement among the wealthy and the great, though doubtless, had he so desired, his fame as a preacher would have numbered many of that class among his pewholders. But feeling that he had a mission to the poor and the depraved, he located his chapel and his residence among them. He selected the borough of Southwark, at that time one of the most wretched districts of the city. Here, during the fearful anti-pope riots of 1780, he had preached to vast congregations, sometimes numbering nearly twenty thousand. Situated on the south side of the Thames, outside the ancient limits of the city, and for a long time an independent borough, it was for many years a sort of sanctuary for malefactors of every description. The vilest passions that disgrace humanity here found indulgence. One of the old chroniclers of London history tells us that in the reign of Henry the Second "there were two *Beare Gardens*, the Old and New, places wherein were kept Beares, Bulls, and other Beasts, to be bayted. As also *Mastives*, in severall kenels, nourished to baite them. These Beares and other Beasts are then baited in plots of ground, scaffolded

about, for the beholders to stand safe. Next on this Banke, was sometimes the *Bordello* or *Stewes*. . . .”* Abandoned wickedness was handed down through the centuries as an heirloom, so that the name of “the Borough” became a synonym for utter vileness with all lovers of decency and good morals.

Though before Mr. Hill’s time this excessive wickedness had greatly abated, there was enough of outrageous depravity left to make it a desirable mission-field for a fearless and independent laborer in his Master’s work. Berridge called it “the very paradise of devils.” Here Rowland Hill erected his citadel, and here for many years he labored among the people, bringing souls to Christ. Surrey Chapel was built in an octagonal form, and was one of the largest churches in London, seating three thousand people. Mr. Hill labored there during the winter months, having an understanding with the trustees of the chapel that he should spend the summer at his rural parish of Wotton-under-Edge, which he still retained under his care. He did not, however, confine himself strictly to these two places, but continued to itinerate as extensively as his circumstances permitted. In his own quaint way he styled himself “Rector of Surrey Chapel, Vicar of Wotton-under-Edge, and Curate of all the fields, commons, etc., throughout England and Wales.”

A review of Rowland Hill’s life during his long ministry of sixty-six years presents to us the picture of a laborious and faithful minister of Christ. During this time he preached more than twenty-three thousand sermons, an average of nearly three hundred and fifty a year. He sometimes preached more than twenty times in a week. At Wotton-under-Edge and in the vicinity he spoke nearly every evening in the week excepting Saturday. This day was not to him, as to many, a time of severe mental toil in preparing for the Sabbath, a toil which often unfits ministers for the labors of the sacred day. He used it as a day of rest for his mind, spending it in gardening and in various mechanical employments, of which he was excessively fond. He repaired clocks, and made cabbage-nets; and not unfrequently this clerical scion of British aristocracy turned cordwainer, and made children’s shoes, which he

* Stowe’s “Survey of London,” 1633.

delighted to present to the young mothers of his parish, who were just as delighted to receive them.

His laborious activity continued even in old age. In his seventy-first year he traveled in one week a hundred miles in a rough, mountainous part of Wales, and preached twenty-one times. When over eighty years old, and so infirm that he was compelled to sit while preaching, he preached regularly twice on the Sabbath; addressed the members of Surrey Chapel on Monday evening, and lectured on Tuesday evening and Friday morning, besides frequently holding special services.

Nor were his labors limited to preaching. His active mind and benevolent heart led him to identify himself with the various charities of the day. On the death of his father in 1783 he obtained a much-needed accession to his fortune, on which he drew largely for charitable purposes. He never saved anything from his annual income, often spending two thirds of it on benevolent objects. He formed soup societies for the hungry, and clothing societies for the naked. He visited convicted law-breakers in prison, and when they were thrown upon the world again at the close of their term of imprisonment he put them in the way of obtaining an honest living. He was among the founders of the Society for Promoting Religious Knowledge among the Poor, the British and Foreign Bible Society, the London Missionary Society, and the Religious Tract Society. All these benevolent institutions found in him a zealous advocate and a liberal contributor.

When, in 1798, Jenner made known his wonderful discovery of vaccination as a preventive of small-pox, no one urged its adoption more ardently than Rowland Hill. Doubtless the staid conservatives of that day, if any such attended his ministry, were shocked to hear him present from the pulpit arguments in favor of vaccination, and urge its practice on its hearers. He went even further than this. He became an amateur operator, and gave public notice to his congregations when and where they might find him ready for the work. For this purpose he traveled extensively in different parts of the country, and vaccinated in all more than eight thousand persons.

His efforts to be useful were also manifested in the interest he took in the Sabbath-school. He was among the first to

co-operate in the great work begun by Robert Raikes, and he helped to originate the Society for the Support and Encouragement of Sunday-Schools. In 1784 he had the honor of organizing, in connection with Surrey Chapel, the first Sabbath-school in the city of London. He was an ardent advocate of the cause at a time when many good men were numbered among its opponents. In 1801 he published "An Apology for Sunday-Schools." Amid all his varied cares and engagements he still found time for frequent visits to this nursery of the Church, spending, when at home, a portion of every Sabbath afternoon with the children. He justly regarded Sabbath-school instruction as a most important auxiliary to the preaching of the word, and by the kindness of his manner, and the interest he threw around his instructions, won to himself the hearts of the little ones. The last address he made was to the Sunday-school teachers of Surrey Chapel, thus keeping the good cause embalmed in his heart to the latest hour of life. At the time of his death there were thirteen Sunday-schools and three thousand scholars connected with his chapel.

In addition to the other benevolent enterprises of his life, he raised funds for the building and maintenance of houses for the destitute poor of his flock. In London he erected near his chapel a neat gothic building, the center of which was appropriated to a school for poor girls, who were clothed and educated by the institution. The wings contained apartments for twenty-four poor women. The only qualifications necessary for admission were "distress and a Christian character." He also built a similar establishment in Wotton-under-Edge. The opening of his London alms-house was suspiciously followed by a revival among some of the destitute old women in the vicinity, who hoped by a profession of piety to obtain a comfortable home. But Mr. Hill, by carefully observing and shrewdly cross-examining the applicants, soon detected the latent hypocrisy, which he hesitated not to rebuke in his severest manner.

As a preacher, Rowland Hill was one of the most popular men of his day. He drew the people toward him by an irresistible charm. His own chapel was always full when he preached, and wherever he went vast crowds waited on his ministry. He preached a number of times to listening thousands

in the celebrated Gwennap Amphitheater, near Redruth in Cornwall, the scene of some of Mr. Wesley's grandest efforts. Here, in full view of the lofty Carn-bre, from whose summit, it is said, the smoke of human sacrifices once ascended, the inquiring multitudes were taught to offer to God the acceptable sacrifice of a broken spirit and a contrite heart. His ministry also attracted even the serious, metaphysical Scotchmen. They were unaccustomed to his peculiar style of preaching, his direct personal appeals, his striking illustrations, and above all, his apt and sometimes amusing anecdotes. One of their preachers states that he never heard an anecdote from a Scotch pulpit until he heard Hill preach. No wonder then that some of them charitably thought that "the poor gentleman was a little cracked." But the masses crowded around him. In Edinburgh he preached in the circus, which had been hired and fitted up by a few zealous men as a place of worship. The audiences soon became larger than the place could hold, and he then went to Calton Hill, where he addressed congregations sometimes estimated at ten thousand, and made up of all classes of society. "Eh, sirs, what will become of us now?" said a good old woman as she observed some soldiers in the crowd, who were one day pressing their way to the hill. "What will this turn to? the very *sodgers* are ganging to hear preaching." That staid and conservative body, the General Assembly, were much excited by the interest created by Mr. Hill's preaching, and they accordingly issued a "Pastoral Admonition," warning the people against countenancing such "irregularities." They might as well have warned them against letting sunshine into their houses whenever it broke through a Scotch mist. The people did as they pleased.

Doubtless much of this popularity was due to the natural advantages possessed by the speaker. The fact that he belonged to a noble family was of itself sufficient to draw many from curiosity. His appearance was also attractive. He was above the average height of men, and of commanding presence, though sometimes unmindful of a due regard to his toilet, if we may credit a story told by Mathews the actor.* His voice

* Mathews says he once saw Rowland Hill "in the Strand, with a red slipper on one foot and a shoe on the other; the knees of his breeches untied, and the strings dangling down his legs."—*Cunningham's London*, vol. i, p. 96.

was one of the clearest and best ever used in preaching the Gospel. Full, sweet, and musical, it could be distinctly heard, even in extreme age, by the largest assemblies. His eccentric friend Berridge, Vicar of Everton, said of him at the beginning of his career: "He is a pretty young spaniel, fit for land or water, and has a wonderful yelp." He once frightened off a party of highwaymen, who attacked his carriage at night. He stood up and raised such a tremendous, unearthly shout, that one of the villains cried out, "We have stopped the devil by mistake, and had better be off." And off they went.

But it was not these natural advantages alone that made him popular. Had he possessed no other nobility than that of voice, appearance, and family connections, his fame, though brilliant as a meteor, would have passed as soon away. Nor can we find the secret of his popularity in the mere matter of his discourses. There were other preachers in his time whose sermons were just as evangelical, and prepared with far more attention to the rigid requirements of rhetorical rules, who were scarcely known beyond the limits of their own congregations. He seems to have had that indescribable, magnetic power, possessed by some gifted men, which throws a spell around an audience, giving the speaker as complete control over the passions of his hearers as the skillful musician has over the instrument whose chords vibrate music at his gentlest touch.

There was also an earnest and hearty sincerity which commended him to the attention and the affection of his hearers. His views of the ministerial office were of the most practical character. He regarded his congregation, not as an audience waiting to be amused, though perchance some had come for that purpose, but as a company of immortal souls, who were to be faithfully warned, earnestly exhorted, and kindly encouraged. His sermons abounded with clear presentations of the doctrines of the Gospel, accompanied by sudden bursts of vivid, sublime, and often singular illustrations. He felt the need of a ministry adapted to the people; not only to their tastes, but to their real wants. Hence the great stirring truths of man's fall and redemption were those on which he delighted to dwell. He was sometimes blamed by high doctrinalists for not preaching to the elect only. His answer on one such occasion was,

"I don't know them, or I would preach to them. Have the goodness to mark them with a bit of chalk, and then I'll talk to them. If it is not right to preach to sinners, to whom am I to preach? for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

Rowland Hill was never noted as a hard student. Indeed, how could he closely apply himself to study when demands were made for his assistance from all parts of the country, keeping him constantly engaged in preaching? His library, though small, was choice. In preparing for the pulpit his first effort was to find, by a critical examination of the original text, the simple, primary meaning of the Holy Spirit. He composed but little, and always preached extempore, being strongly opposed to reading sermons. His discourses were chiefly expository, and were full of illustrations, some of them quaint, and many of them drawn from surrounding circumstances. He possessed, in a larger measure than most ministers, the faculty of adapting his illustrations to the capacities and peculiarities of his audience. The Rev. William Jay, in Mr. Hill's funeral sermon, remarks that his preaching "consisted in pleasing and striking sentiments and sentences. I never heard him in my life without hearing something solemn and pathetic; and when simile has not been followed by example, just as the sunshine succeeds an April shower." "He brought down argument and thought to the reach of the plainest capacity, and then, by some familiar, or shrewd, or striking allusion, furnished it with a handle by which his hearers could take it away."*

At one time, having gone to preach in a manufacturing town on a week-day, while walking in company with the pastor of the Church through the streets to the place of worship, he stopped at almost every shop to examine the different articles manufactured. His good friend the pastor was somewhat annoyed by this, fearing that the preacher's attention would be so diverted by passing scenes that the congregation would have a poor sermon. But Mr. Hill had not preached long ere the pastor discovered that what had so troubled him was only a part of the preacher's preparation for his work. He illustrated the truths he enforced on his delighted audience by reference to the various objects with which their daily

* *Christian Observer*, vol. xxxiii, p. 350.

employment made them familiar, even making the smoke which curled from their towering chimneys a dark background on which he pictured truth to their minds. He showed in this that he had been a diligent disciple at the feet of the Great Teacher, who, when he addressed the people, brought to his service the lilies, the birds, the precious pearls, and the fruitful seeds, and even despised not such humble things as the leaven and the besom of the housewife, the net of the fisherman, or the old garment, threadbare and torn.

He could seldom preach well unless his feelings were excited, and hence, like most men of his temperament—ay, and may we not say, like men of all temperaments—he occasionally had “a hard time.” His mind under such circumstances refused to act freely, and though he labored hard he seemed to spend his strength for nothing. But he never allowed himself to get embarrassed by this want of success. Cool and collected, when all other means had been tried and failed, he opened several safety-valves which he always kept within convenient reach for such extreme cases. He first gave a lecture to masters and mistresses on the duties they owed to their servants. If, by the time he finished this, his mind worked clearly, he resumed the subject of his discourse; but if the difficulty continued, he proceeded to berate the Antinomians and Socinians. By this time the hour of service would be nearly gone, and looking at the clock he would say, “I see your time does not permit me to go through the subject; perhaps we may resume it on the next Sabbath.” One day, while preaching from the text, “My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed,” and failing to make much headway, he exclaimed, after a momentary pause, “O, my dear brethren, it is a good thing to have the heart well fixed on the *doctrines* of the Gospel.” Here was an inexhaustible source of relief, and he did not fail to improve it. He explained justification, and then noticed some other doctrines, the time all the while gliding away, and at last he looked up at the clock, and remarking that the time did not permit him to finish, he sat down relieved.

This tact and coolness in presence of an audience were often of great service to him. In the early part of his ministry he attempted one day to preach in a seaport town to a crowd of sailors. He spoke in the open air, and seated on horseback.

He was, however, frequently interrupted by the rudeness of his unruly congregation. They hooted and hissed, and occasionally threw various missiles at the speaker. Finding it useless to proceed further he stopped preaching, and turning to some of the noisiest, asked them to give in turn an account of their travels and adventures on the sea. This novel proposal excited much merriment, and when good-humor was restored and their attention drawn to him, he told them what he had intended to say had they listened, and thus succeeded in preaching his sermon to them in spite of their opposition. The rough tars listened with tokens of interest and approbation, and at the close gave him three hearty English cheers, and asked him to come again.

He once, by a little shrewd management, completely outwitted his excellent brother Richard, whom his father sent to him on business of a somewhat delicate nature. As we have already noticed, his father entirely disapproved of his irregularities in the ministerial work. Learning that Rowland was preaching in the streets of Bristol, he sent Richard to admonish his young brother, and if possible to induce him to desist. When Richard reached the city he ascertained that his brother had gone to Kingwood to preach to the colliers. He immediately followed him there and heard him preach. He saw the effects of this preaching on the poor colliers, noticed their profound attention, and witnessed the deep emotion of their rough natures as the tears made channels down their blackened cheeks. Rowland saw Richard in the crowd, and surmising his errand, told the audience that "he had no doubt his brother, Richard Hill, Esq., whom he was happy to see among them, would speak to them the following day on the great truths of the Gospel." Richard had been a lay preacher, but at the earnest solicitation of his father had a few months before this desisted from the work. He was entirely taken by surprise at Rowland's bold announcement, but having been deeply moved by the scene he witnessed, he dared not, as a good man, decline, and on the next day actually did the very thing for which his father had sent him to censure his brother. It is said, however, that when he reached home, and thought of the "irregularity" of the proceeding, he deeply regretted what he had done.

Many were attracted to Rowland Hill's ministry by his eccentricities. To many of the present generation, who know him only as belonging to the past, the bare mention of his name is suggestive of a pulpit joke. Many are the singular stories concerning him which have found their way into the jest books and newspapers, some of them gross exaggerations of facts, and others having no foundation whatever in truth. In his latter days, when the mellowness of advancing years had somewhat chastened his native humor, Mr. Hill was very much annoyed by these spurious anecdotes. One in particular gave him extreme pain, since it represented him as wanting in proper respect for his wife, by administering to her a public reproof on occasion of her appearing in Surrey Chapel with a new bonnet. When he saw this story in print he was greatly grieved. "Sir," said he to a friend, "I hope that the Christian minister, if not the gentleman, always prevented me from making my wife a laughing-stock for the amusement of the vulgar." Doubtless many of the facetious stories of eminent men which serve to fill the columns of magazines and newspapers have as little basis in truth as this. But if men will be odd, as well as eminent, they must not wonder if some unscrupulous story-maker should use their names to give point and interest to his false narratives.

Rowland Hill never *affected* eccentricity as many do, seeking to cater to a vitiated taste, and making the house of God a place for Sunday amusements. Whatever oddities he had were natural. We do not make this a plea for justifying all his whimsicalities, since it is not always safe or right to indulge our natural propensities: they should rather be chastened and subdued. We simply state the fact. He was cheerful and witty from a boy, and always had a taste for the ludicrous. One who knew him intimately asserts, "Had not God changed his heart, he would probably have made one of the first comedians of his day." This natural proclivity to mirthfulness was indulged rather than restrained. It is not improbable that his intercourse and intimacy with Berridge exercised an unconscious influence over him in this respect. Berridge was himself noted for oddity, and Hill became acquainted with him at a time when his own habits were forming, and when, perhaps, a friend and adviser of another stamp would have led him to modify and

temper his mirthful propensity instead of indulging it. But the two were drawn together by a common feeling of zeal and earnestness in the cause of God, and this gave Berridge a strong influence over the young student. Hill, however, would undoubtedly have been odd had he never seen the eccentric old vicar of Everton; and the blessing which the good old man was made to the persecuted student more than counterbalanced any additional singularities of which his example may have been the innocent cause.

Mr. Hill's eccentricities were in manner only, and not in matter. He made no effort to dazzle his hearers with brilliant theories, and had no desire to mystify them with metaphysical speculations. He never cared to wander comet-like from the great central sun of truth into the dark and unknown regions of error, but steadily kept in his orbit, pursuing faithfully the path of duty from year to year. He was conscientious also, as well as natural, in the means he used to attract and interest the people. He wished to arrest the attention of the lower orders, who he felt were too much neglected by the clergy of his time. That in endeavoring to accomplish this desirable result he sometimes overstepped the bounds of propriety, and seemed to trifle with serious things, there can be no doubt. Yet Rowland Hill cannot justly be called a trifler. He felt that he had a serious duty to discharge in calling sinners to repentance, and whatever was eccentric in his manner he endeavored to make subordinate to this one great end. Nor did he indulge in witticisms in every sermon. There were times when he held his audience spellbound and in tears from the commencement of the discourse to its close.

But while Mr. Hill honestly thought that he might make use of his humorous power to attract the careless hearer to God's house, he was also keenly alive to the fact that he sometimes went too far in this direction. This excess of drollery in the pulpit was then followed by tears and lamentations in private. According to his own confession, many of the bitterest moments of his life were thus occasioned. At one time he preached a sermon at Brighton, a portion of which produced much laughter among the congregation, though he closed his discourse with an awful appeal to their consciences, which brought tears to all eyes. After he had retired for the night,

at the house where he was visiting, a friend hearing a noise in the passage way stepped out to inquire the cause, and found Mr. Hill pacing the hall in the deepest agony of mind, mourning over the ill-timed mirthfulness in which he had indulged while preaching.

Mr. Hill seems to have succeeded better as a preacher than as a controversialist. He early became a famous pamphleteer, but he so often indulged in vituperative language and in gross personalities that he alienated from himself some of his best friends. Notwithstanding the so-called irregularity of his course as a minister, he enjoyed the favor and friendship of many of the clergymen of the Church of England until the appearance of his "Spiritual Characteristics." This work contained many severe and caustic remarks against irreligious and inconsistent ministers, and excited strong prejudices against him by its extreme harshness. His friends were grieved by the style of the book, and his enemies were exasperated and made worse. After this publication he only received occasional invitations to preach in the churches of the Establishment, and then chiefly in country places. His controversy with the Scotch divines on occasion of the "Pastoral Admonition" of the General Assembly, already referred to, was conducted in a similar style of bitterness.

In his dispute with Mr. Wesley on their doctrinal differences he pursued the same course, notwithstanding Mr. Wesley was forty years his senior. He openly accused him of "forgeries" and of "falsehood," and styled him "an empiric or quack doctor." Mr. Wesley says of him: "For forty or fifty years have I been a little acquainted with controversial writers, some of the Romish persuasion, some of our own Church, some dissenters of various denominations. And I have found many among them as *angry* as he, but one so *bitter* I have not found."* It is due to the memory of Mr. Hill to say that he regretted in later years the spirit he manifested in this controversy.

It was this same spirit which occasioned the alienation of feeling between himself and Lady Huntingdon. At the commencement of his ministry he often preached in her chapel to delighted crowds, and among them some of the noblest families

* "Some Remarks on Mr. Hill's Review."—*Works*, vol. vi, p. 145, Am. ed.

in the land. But his views of Church polity differed somewhat from hers. In truth he never relished the idea of women ruling in the Church, and he seems to have thought her too fond of authority. This she could have endured; but when he carried his opposition so far as to make her and her followers the subjects of some of his ill-timed pulpit jokes, taking them "all up into the pulpit as his merry-andrews," her womanly spirit was roused. She never fully forgave him this ridicule, though she afterward spoke well of his labors, and contributed to the erection of Surrey Chapel. But she resolutely refused to permit him to preach in any of her chapels, uttering her refusals with an emphasis and an authority which made them irrevocable.

Mr. Hill was to the last devotedly attached to the Church of England, though he deeply deplored her defects. He had no sympathy with the exclusive notions of some churchmen, but opened his pulpit to ministers of all evangelical denominations, and frequently exchanged with them. When some of the rigid ones declared that such union with dissenters was "riding upon the back of order and decorum," his reply was, "Happy should I be to ride upon the back of *such* order and decorum till I had ridden them to death." In token of his utter contempt for such High Church notions, he actually named one of his carriage horses "Order," and the other "Decorum!"

He loved the liturgy of the Church, and used it every Sabbath in his chapel. But in Church government he was neither Episcopal nor Congregational, but combined the two. Said he, in speaking on this subject, "I am, all things considered, for a reduced episcopacy, a reformed liturgy, and the election of the minister by the suffrages of the people." He thus occupied an independent position, having no formal connection with the establishment, nor with any other ecclesiastical organization. He formed a religious society peculiarly his own, having as its standard of doctrine the Articles of the Church of England.

In spite of his defects, Rowland Hill was a faithful and successful minister of Jesus Christ. He early sacrificed worldly position and ecclesiastical preferment in deference to his own convictions of duty. He chose to share the poverty, contumely,

and labors of a faithful living ministry, rather than bask in the sunshine of paternal favor, or recline at ease upon the fat livings of the Church. His love of souls led him especially among those who, by reason of their poverty or their crimes, were neglected by the fastidious and slothful wearers of the surplice, who sneeringly styled his self-denying labors "irregularities." The busy streets of the metropolis, the quiet retreats of the rural districts, the mountains and the mines, the river-side and the sea-shore, were all the scenes of his toils and his trials, as they were frequently the witnesses of his joys and his triumphs.

His robust English constitution endured these labors far beyond the period at which men ordinarily cease to toil. He continued preaching long after the growing infirmities of age reminded him that the "silver cord" of life was loosening; and when he became too weak to stand in his accustomed place before the people, he addressed them in a sitting posture. His last sermon was preached in Surrey Chapel, from 1 Cor. ii, 7, 8, on the last day of March, 1833. Eleven days afterward his Master called him from labor to reward.

ART. V.—ÆSCHINES AND ELOQUENCE.

THE question of precedence among the Attic orators was long since decided by the acclamations of the Athenians, and their verdict has been unanimously approved by more than sixty generations of men who have lived since Demosthenes descended from the bema. There were once sturdy contestants who struggled long and bravely for the throne of eloquence on which the Pæanian now sits apart from other men, as Jupiter sat on the highest peak of Olympus apart from the other gods. Foremost among those who fought for that high seat was Æschines, the celebrated champion of the political opposition to Demosthenes. It is extremely unfortunate for Æschines that his truly great oratorical abilities are never regarded independently in their own light, but are always viewed in the dazzling resplendence of his antagonist. Thus the Grecian

Mercury, like the Mercury of our planetary system, is doomed to a perpetual eclipse by excess of light.

This orator was born B. C. 389, and was four years older than Demosthenes. They were both nurtured amid the civil wars which were rocking Greece into ruins—wars instigated by Persian intrigue and royal gold to destroy the unity of the Hellenic nationality. At that time the *ηγεμονία* of the Greek confederacy was passing in quick succession from Athens to Sparta, from Sparta to Thebes, and from Thebes to Philip, never more to return to gild those little republics with its evanescent splendors. It is a favorite theory with some, that as a compensation for the wide material desolations of war, there is always an impetus given to mind; that amid the earthquake of human passion the stone is rolled away from the sepulchre, and genius has a glorious resurrection.

Of the early history of Æschines we know little, except what has been preserved in the speeches of his great opponent. Hence we must make allowance for the influence of prejudice and bitter enmity. In the last oration of Demosthenes there is preserved, like a fly embalmed in amber, a sneer at his antagonist because he was the son of a schoolmaster, and assisted his father in the care of the school-house—a disgrace which the people of these northern states, and those who sympathize with their notions of the dignity of labor, are incapable of appreciating. Æschines next appears as an actor in the Athenian theater, in the days when the Dionysian orchestra sustained to Grecian eloquence and literature the relation which the London stage, in the age of Shakespeare, sustained to English oratory and letters. Demosthenes ridicules his performances as complete failures—a statement which seems hardly compatible with his subsequent brilliant career as a popular orator. It is probable that a degree of success attended the young tragedian, and that the stage was to him what it was to Sheridan, a school of oratorical discipline stimulating to elocutionary culture, and imparting confidence in the presence of vast audiences. It must be remembered that the theater in the age of Sophocles was not a mere play-house, a center of attraction for the idle and dissolute, a mart where the cyprian could make merchandise of her beauty; but it was a dignified, municipal institution for the education of the public

in the absence of the university, the library, the lyceum lecture, and the newspaper. Æschines next appears to good advantage on the battle-field, where his valor is commended by his general, and he is honored with the announcement of the victory. What elements his military life contributed to his oratory we cannot point out; but his known bravery in the face of death gave him a decided advantage over Demosthenes in their last struggle, in which Æschines repeatedly hurls at him the charge of cowardice. But the occupation in which he next engaged, more than anything else, laid the foundation of his future eminence in statesmanship and eloquence. He became clerk of the *ἐκκλησία*, the legislative assembly of the Athenian democracy. Here he became thoroughly versed in the laws and polity of the government.

In a healthy democracy, which is preserved from oligarchy on the one hand, and from ochlocracy on the other, only by the safeguard of the statutes, there must always be great reverence for constitutional principles and legal enactments. The political orator must be able to appeal to this popular reverence, by presenting himself as the champion of his country's institutions, and the vindicator of her laws. How skillfully Æschines used the legal knowledge here acquired we shall see when we come to be spectators of his last grapple with the invincible athlete of the Pnyx and the Agora. While patiently performing the drudgery of his humble office, he was, in reality, taking lessons in the greatest school of parliamentary and forensic eloquence ever opened on the earth. Day after day and year after year during that brief but brilliant era the best models stood before him on the bema. Ascending that cubic block of marble, crowned with chaplets of myrtle, symbolizing at once the kingliness of the orator's vocation and the sacredness of his person while exercising his divine faculty, those monarchs of mind ruled, each his hour, with more than regal scepter. That scepter the grave and pithy Phocion now sheaths his sword to wield, and now the weighty and elaborate Lysurgus waves that symbol of dominion over those tumultuous freemen; and now Callistratus takes up that rod of power, and, smiting the soul of the lad Demosthenes, opens a perennial fountain of eloquence; anon the dashing, facetious Demades grasps that staff of empire, and makes even the

prince of orators bow before the spontaneous outbursts of his native eloquence. Here also the argumentative and far-seeing Hyperides proposes to the trembling fugitives from Chæronea, the *dernier* resort of the tottering republic, "emancipate and arm the slaves." And here, when afterward indicted for his abolitionism, he made his memorable defense: "What do ye reproach me with? Proposing to give slaves their liberty? I did so to save freemen from becoming slaves." Alas! Athens heeded not the voice of her savior; but in the insane attempt to save both slavery and freedom she went down into that grave which knows no resurrection.

Such are some of the brighter stars in that constellation of eloquence which daily culminated over the Athenian assembly. To that galaxy must be added a name outshining all others. For Demosthenes, in contrasting the dignity of his own history with the humble life of Æschines, though his junior, utters the proud boast, "you were scribe of the ecclesia, I harangued the people." Association with orators is an incentive to the study of the art. Eloquence in men is as much a mimetic art as talking is in children. Not only are the outward expression and the marshaling of words into sentences in all speakers an unconscious reproduction of the patterns by which they have been surrounded, but the very spirit of oratory is contagious. A genuine orator surrounds himself with an atmosphere pervaded by the subtle electricity of thought and feeling; and all within his sphere receive the inspiration of his genius, as the unelectrified conductor becomes inductively excited by the mere vicinity of the battery, or as common iron becomes magnetic by long contact with loadstones.

Having alluded to the influences which conspired to mould this orator, we now turn to his orations. Of the many speeches which such a leading statesman must have made, but three remain. These have been styled the three Graces. All who read them are struck with the fitness of this appellation. They were all spoken directly or indirectly against Demosthenes. This may account for their preservation, while those not interlinked with the orations of his illustrious rival have failed to partake of his immortality. The limits of this paper forbid a review of the three. We will, therefore, examine that one which is the crowning grace of the triad, the Oration on the Crown. This

last effort of Æschines comprises the substance of all his previous speeches in that long struggle, which ended at last in his personal defeat and exile. The same may be said of Demosthenes' defense; it is a recapitulation of all his former orations, for such was his singleness of aim through all his life, that all his speeches are capable of compression into one magnificent whole, without violating the rhetorical canon of unity. The brilliancy and power of both the orations *De Corona*, unprecedented in the annals of ancient eloquence, in melancholy contrast with the waning grandeur of Greece, and the speedy extinction of the Athenian state, remind us of the fabled sweetness of the swan's last song as she floats down the river charming away the fear of death with her own melody. These orations may be regarded as the funeral eulogies of Attic eloquence. To appreciate the arguments on both sides, we must understand the political constitution of Greece and her history during that period; a study eminently appropriate for Americans in the present crisis of our institutions, and especially for those who look for peace in a cowardly acquiescence in the destruction of the federal principle underlying our republic. Fifteen independent sovereignties in the Peloponnesus and in Hellas proper, with the numerous islands of the Archipelago, and the Greek colonies of Asia Minor, and of Magna Græcia, Southern Italy, constituted the *οἱ Ἕλληνες*. This confederacy was an assembly of kindred states in treaty relations, retaining and frequently exercising the right of seceding and of warring against each other in genuine Carolinian style. Moreover, every city claimed the right of autonomy and a *quasi* independence of its own state. The idea of a grand, representative, federal, government for all the Greeks, while each state retained a modified sovereignty over its internal affairs—the conception of a consolidated republic, *E Pluribus Unum*, was beyond the grasp of Grecian statesmanship. This ill-compacted league, with no executive head, save the state which was victorious in the last battle, with no federal legislature, and no supreme court, except a politico-religious body exercising some judicial functions, styled the Amphictyonic Council, was no match for the ambitious autocrat of Macedonia. Philip observing from his northern watch-tower the dissolution of the Grecian empire by chronic jealousies and intermittent civil wars,

resolved to put a brilliant in his diadem by the conquest and annexation of that country which was the center of civilization and the intellectual sensorium of the world. He was a statesman devoid of moral scruples, regarding his oath only while it was for his advantage. He freely scattered bribes in the countries against which he had hostile designs, and he always found palms open to receive the wages of treason. His maxim was, that any citadel could be taken into which there was a door large enough to admit an ass laden with gold. He has no congressional committees to pry into his purposes; he keeps his own secrets and moves steadily to his object. The Athenian allied cities on his borders are embroiled in war, and fall into his hands, thus obtaining the same Mediterranean sea-coast which the Russian czar has so long coveted. A sacred war for the vindication of the temple at Delphi arises in Greece, and Philip piously espouses the cause of the insulted Apollo, chastises the sacrilegious Phocians, procures their expulsion from the Amphyctionic Council, secures the admission of barbaric Macedon and his own election to the presidency. Under the pretext of piety he has taken a long stride toward his coveted prize. Thermopylæ, the key of Greece, is in his hand, and in every city there is a strong party in his interest, through the combined influence of religious superstition and Macedonian gold. He has control of the Delphic Oracle, and henceforth the Pythia will philipize. For tyrants in every age, whether they wield the scepter, the crosier, or the plantation whip, instinctively poison the fountains of religion. Thus with noiseless footfall the enemy of democracy steals into slumbering Greece. But there is one sleepless eye intent on the wily foe, one tongue rings out a ceaseless alarm, one person is ubiquitous in journeyings and embassies, checkmating Philip at every point. The name of Demosthenes becomes the synonym of union and war. The principal obstacle to his patriotic endeavors is the Macedonian party which he everywhere encounters. Under the guise of peace men, deprecating the cost and the horrors of war, they constituted a formidable opposition to Demosthenes, and an auxiliary invaluable to Philip. Æschines was the leader of this faction, into which some men of incorruptible integrity and unquestionable patriotism had been unwarily drawn. This fact rendered the work

of the Athenian patriot more difficult, and greatly strengthened the hands of his opponent. To amuse the people with plausible excuses for the mysterious movements of his Macedonian master, was the work of the one; to strip off the disguise which enrobed traitors, and to arouse the Greeks from their fatal stupor, and to hurl them in one solid battalion against the destroyer of their liberties, was the work of the other. To us who study this great contest in the light of subsequent events, and to whom the policy of Philip is clearly disclosed by history, the argument may seem to be all on one side. But to the Athenians unable to divine the secret purposes of the Macedonian, and incapable of attributing to a second rate barbarian power a scheme of conquest so ambitious, and sorrowfully experienced in the ruin and hazards of war, there were two sides to the question. The result of the great debate was doubtful. But while the scales were thus evenly poised, Philip drops his mask and makes a bold move, menacing Boeotia and Attica. The seizure of Elatea caused an uprising of the Greeks like that which occurred when the beacons, blazing from Land's End to Margate, announced to infuriated Englishmen the approach of the Spanish armada, or like that sublime mustering of half a million of brave Americans when the many-tongued telegraph whispered in every city and village the story of America's dishonor in the tragic fall of Sumter. The Grecian party are now in the ascendant, Æschines hides his head, and the star of Demosthenes mounts to the meridian. Swayed by his eloquence, and by the logic of events, the states unite and march to repel the invader, and are totally vanquished at Chæronea. Demosthenes is in the panic-stricken mob in their flight from that great disaster. Now the tables are suddenly turned in Athenian politics. The patriotic orator whose prophetic vision of victory has been dispelled by the rude shock of arms, and whose portraiture of Philip's ferocity has been falsified by his politic lenity toward Athens, now conceals himself from the unexpected reaction in the public opinion of his countrymen. He dares not appear on his former throne of power, the bema, and no vote is allowed to be proposed in the name of the humbled champion of liberty. The name of Philip, once uttered in the Pnyx with execration, is now pronounced with adulation. To check the huzzas of the

Macedonian party, and to shield the fallen statesman from the insolence of his enemies, a formal popular ovation is planned by his friends, and it is resolved that Ctesiphon propose in the assembly his public coronation for virtue and patriotism. Unfortunately the proposition contravened certain laws of the state. After its passage through the Senate, Æschines arrests the proposed vote, by prosecuting the mover for bringing forward an illegal decree. Demosthenes is retained ostensibly to defend Ctesiphon, but really to vindicate himself. It would seem that the delays of the law are a vexation of no recent origin. For eight years this important suit is postponed; and for eight years these vengeful demi-gods collect their thunders. During this time Philip falls by the hand of the assassin, and Demosthenes excites an abortive revolt against the youthful Alexander, which occasions the complete annihilation of Thebes. Still more recently the restless patriot had encouraged Sparta and several other Peloponnesian states to a disastrous insurrection against Antipater, the Macedonian viceroy. These recent failures had added to the odium against Demosthenes, and had furnished his merciless enemies with new weapons for his destruction. Probably Æschines had deferred the prosecution of the indictment, fearing the result. For if he should fail to receive one fifth of the votes of the dicasts, his suit would be pronounced malicious, and he would be subjected to a heavy fine. But after long watching the currents of public opinion he now sees the tide of Macedonian influence at its flood, and he resolves to press the indictment. His malice overshoots its mark, and his arrow rebounds and wounds his own head. Not satisfied with the negative victory over his rival by a continual postponement of the trial and preventing of the crowning, eager for a positive triumph over his hated rival, he risks and loses all. At length the day is fixed for the last conflict of these intellectual gladiators, a day which shall witness the exultation of one and the downfall of the other on the bloodless arena. Public expectation, so long excited, now stands on tiptoe, and from every part of Greece, politicians and students of oratory, the old and the young, throng the highways to Athens, to gaze upon the *finale* of that exciting struggle which had extended through almost a score of years. The intellectual banquet was worth the longest journey made to

enjoy it. The court, probably for the better accommodation of the vast concourse, was held *sub divo* in the *agora*, the identical place where, three hundred and eighty-three years afterward, the gospel of Christ and Grecian philosophy had their first collision in the persons of St. Paul, and the Epicureans, and the Stoics. Demosthenes, though strong in conscious rectitude, and in the justice of his cause, might well tremble in view of the proverbial ingratitude of his country to her sons illustrious for their virtues and their services. Dark, indeed, was the record of that nation which had dethroned the placable Thymætes, impeached the heroic Miltiades, banished the politic Themistocles, pronounced the death sentence upon the monotheistic Anaxagoras, ostracised the incorruptible Cimon, maddened to suicide the soldierly Paches, in one day rewarded with death six victorious commodores, exiled Aristides the Just, and poisoned Socrates the Saint. Might not the annals of Athens' shame be brought to a fitting close with the recorded immolation, upon the altar of her caprices, of that immortal orator who had laid his splendid gifts a holocaust upon the altar of her liberties?

In his exordium Æschines accomplishes the purpose at which, according to Quintilian, the speaker should aim, *reddere auditores benevolos, attentos, dociles*. By insinuation he disparages his opponent, commends himself, and compliments his judges. The ancient rhetoricians studied the arts of conciliation much more carefully than the modern. In the words of Cicero, they made "all the vestibule and, if I may so say, the avenue to their cause brilliant." The apostle to the Gentiles evinces this kind of rhetorical training, making the approach to his cause brilliant, now quoting their favorite prophets to the Jews, or speaking that tongue which was music in their ears, now lighting up the avenue of the gospel to dark Athenian hearts by commending their religious veneration, and by adorning his speech with gems from their classic poets, and now ingratiating himself with Felix and Festus by praising their candor and experience. In the exordium of Demosthenes the good-will of the dicasts is conciliated in a manner perfectly consonant with his bold and vigorous style. At the first opening of his lips, he enwraps the whole assembly with a feeling of deep religious awe, by vividly setting before them the whole

array of Olympian deities gazing upon them from their lofty thrones. After his workmanlike introduction, Æschines proceeds in a straightforward, logical, lawyer-like argument, adroitly classifying himself with Solon, the Washington of the republic, and assuming that it is his special mission to guard the sanctity of the laws enacted by the father of his country, and wantonly violated by the defendants in the suit. The word *Δημοκρατία* is perpetually on his lips. We are struck with the similarity which there is between the Grecian and the American abuse of this popular term. A philipizing sycophant, guilty of the loss of his country's independence, ringing changes on democracy and claiming its exclusive guardianship, is a sight no more disgusting than an American oligarch, with his foot on the neck of a prostrate race, prating of the people's liberties while mustering armies for the destruction of all their safeguards. Æschines clearly and unanswerably proves two points of illegality: that Demosthenes, being accountable for his public offices, was not a proper person to be crowned; and secondly, that the place of the proposed crowning was contrary to existing laws. Had he been satisfied to let his prosecution rest on these points, he must have been victorious; but by endeavoring to prove too much, he rears up some structures on sandy foundations, against which his antagonist's impetuous eloquence dashes, and, converting them to drift-wood, by this means sweeps away in the general ruin even the rock-based edifices constructed with so much skill and toil. Hence a caution may be inferred by disputants, not to multiply arguments, but to confine themselves to a few which cannot be successfully controverted. The untenable position which the speaker attempts to maintain is, that the character and administration of his opponent are undeserving a crown. He was not competent to discuss this point at all under the *παρανόμων γραφή*, for there was no law against the expression of a mistaken opinion in a legislative resolve. This would have been an intolerable restriction of free speech, and repugnant to the Athenian constitution. But the prosecutor so ardently desires to strike the character and policy of his great enemy, that he descends to the trick of perverting the meaning of a law against smuggling counterfeit laws into the archives, and he applies this statute to the insertion of errors in a proposition for legislative action.

But with the legal fallacy we are not at present concerned. The logical or rhetorical blunder of associating one inconclusive argument with two valid ones, thus giving his opponent the advantage of seeming to demolish the sound reasons in his annihilation of the unsound one, was fatal to Æschines. In vain does he attempt to avert the consequences of his folly, by beseeching the judges to prescribe for Demosthenes such an order of topics as to compel him to answer the two valid counts in the indictment before he should take up the point in which the chief strength of his adversary lay. Had the judges been so unjust as to interfere with the arrangement of his arguments, either to retrieve the error or to gratify the malice of the prosecutor, it is probable that Demosthenes, thus driven to the wall, and forced to defend untenable positions, before a dispassionate jury would have been overwhelmed in defeat. But the dicasts prescribed no order of reply, and the defendant, by a movement declared by Lord Brougham as masterly as that of Napoleon at Wagram, selects his own ground for fighting the battle, and renders his enemy's strong intrenchments entirely useless. The thing above all others which Æschines should have avoided, both in the structure of his indictment and of his plea, was affording to Demosthenes any occasion for discussing the general affairs of Greece and his own political relation to them; for here his record was not only spotless, but glorious. On this theme, so congenial to his own sanguine nature and vehement eloquence, he was sure to sweep away the dry legal points made against him, as the hurricane brushes away the gossamer webs of the spider. But Æschines permitted himself to be as completely outgeneraled as did Lord Howe, when he committed the military blunder of leaving Dorchester Heights to be seized by Washington: a fault which the crestfallen Briton expiated by evacuating Boston with a cloud on his fame and a stain on England's arms.

But though Æschines made a great mistake in opening a political discussion with his antagonist, nevertheless his rhetorical power shines forth here in great splendor. His periods are flowing, yet concise and lucid. His Greek, the student who has mastered Demosthenes will find to be easy. At every step his style reminds us of the transparency, purity, and grace of Plato's diction. It is probable that this resemblance to the

prince of philosophers has given rise to the tradition that Æschines was once his pupil; for the lips of Plato dropped not only the sweets of philosophy but the honey of eloquence. Says Cicero: "I confess that I have been made an orator, (if indeed I am one at all,) or such as I am, not by the workshops of the rhetoricians, but by the walks of the Academy." He infers from the letters of Demosthenes that he was likewise a constant student of Plato.

We know of no writer who excels Æschines in brilliancy of imagination. His descriptive powers surpass even Demosthenes. The one paints, the other apostrophizes; the one pleases, the other storms; you admire the style of the one, you see nothing but the glowing thought of the other. In his assault upon the character of his opponent there is a passage which has attracted the notice of many rhetoricians, ancient and modern. The author of the Tusculan Questions becomes enthusiastic in his exclamations of delight. "*At quam rhetorice! quam copiose! quas sententias colligit! quæ verba contorquet!*" Junius—*stat umbra*—that mightiest and wickedest master of the English language, in his flagitious attack on the Duke of Bedford for engaging in public business in the days of mourning for his only son, has only imitated a portion of this celebrated piece of acrimonious vituperation. No translation can import into English the full measure of gall with which it is brimming. But the passage is too long to be inserted in the Greek text.

And yet, Athenians, this enormous flatterer, having heard from the emissaries of Charidemus of the death of Philip, but pretending to have had it revealed to him in a vision from the gods, as if he had learned the event, not from Charidemus, but from Jupiter and Minerva, who as he says appeared to him in the night and foretold it to him—to him in the night! they whom he perjures himself by in the daytime!—this monstrous flatterer, I say, on the one hand came before you with a lie in his mouth, and on the other, only seven days after the death of his daughter, before he had mourned and performed the usual rites to the dead, came forth in public, crowned with a garland, and dressed in white to sacrifice; he, the wretch, who had lost the only one and the first one who had ever called him father. I say not this to upbraid him with his affliction, but I scrutinize his character. For the unnatural and bad father cannot be a good citizen, nor will he who has no affection for those who are nearest and most closely allied to him value you above foreigners; nor could it be possible for him who is base in private

to become virtuous in public; nor could he who was not virtuous in public at home become honest and upright in the embassy in Macedonia, for he changed not his character, but only his place.

The last clause contains the most splendid paronomasia which we have met with in any writer except Isaiah. "*Οὐ γὰρ τὸν τόπον, ἀλλὰ τὸν τόπον μόνον μετήλλαξεν.*" The charming assonance of the contrasted words in this concise, well balanced, and stinging antithesis, must have delighted the itching ears of the excitable Athenians. There is no doubt that Horace had this passage in view when he penned that admired verse in one of his epistles,

Cælum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt.

The passage containing the most pungent sarcasm is that which portrays Demosthenes standing on the tombs of those slain at Chaeronea, pronouncing their funeral eulogium. For immediately after that disastrous battle, he was selected by his fellow-citizens to perform this sad service for their fallen brethren.

Here it is just to call to remembrance those good men whom this fellow sent forth, with ill-omened sacrifices, to manifest destruction; upon whose tombs mounting with those cowardly feet which ran away from their post, he pronounced an encomium upon their bravery! Can you, who are most worthless in all the grave interests of men, but most wonderful in the bravery of words, look into the faces of these judges and say that you ought to be crowned for the disasters of the state?

In showing the absurdity of crowning Demosthenes, the speaker transports the dicasts to the theater, the place proposed for bestowing that honor; and he calls upon them to listen to the proclamation of the herald, and to witness the tears which flow, not for the heroes of the tragedies, but for the folly of the state; tears shed by the kindred of those slain in battle, who now witness the crowning of the slayer of their husbands, brothers, and fathers. He then sets in array the orphans nurtured by the state to the day of their majority, now panoplied to go forth to the duties of life with her blessing upon them, and her voice calling them to the highest office within her gift. Then the skillful orator contrasts this scene, which is such an incentive to valor and virtue, with the public coronation of one who had proved a poltroon on the bloody field, and asks which the judges will set before the youth of the city as an incitement

to high moral excellence. These graphic contrasts are wrought out with great power, and they must have deeply impressed the audience.

In exhibiting the disastrous consequences of his rival's war policy, by which Thebes was incited to revolt against Macedon, he portrays the taking and utter extinction of that city in the liveliest colors, making the whole wretched scene, which the Roman master of oratory has twice imitated, pass before our eyes. We see the doomed city assaulted by the inexorable Alexander, and a few of its citizens escaping to Athens; we witness the digging down of the walls, the destruction of the temples and tombs, the conflagration of the houses, the slaughter of the husbands and sons, the wives and maidens, in sorrowful bands, led away into slavery, the old men and women late in life unlearning the lessons of liberty, and all weeping and lifting up their hands in supplication, indignant, not at their misfortunes, but at him who is their cause, and solemnly adjuring the Athenians not to crown the guilty destroyer of Greece. By the test proposed in the *Ars Poetica*, the description is absolutely faultless; for if every word were a pencil stroke on the canvas, there would be not the least incongruity in this historical painting. The skill with which the pathos excited by this scene is directed against Demosthenes is a master-stroke of oratory. But still more admirable is the skill with which Demosthenes parries this tremendous blow and makes it rebound with fatal effect upon his antagonist, by showing the hypocrisy of his lamentations over Thebes, who had received confiscated Boeotian estates as a reward for his betrayal of Greece. Here we mark another cause of Æschines' failure, *insincerity in his pathetic appeals*.

We cannot review his discussion of the various parts of the administration of his political adversary, the measures adopted and the alliances contracted. This part of the argument he concludes with the assertion that no private citizen nor state ever prospered under the ill-fated counsels of his antagonist. The nail thus driven in is clenched by the following striking illustration containing an acute *à fortiori* argument: "O Athenians, since you have legislated respecting the ferrymen to Salamis that if any one involuntarily upsets his boat in the passage it shall be unlawful for him ever to become a ferryman

again, as a safeguard against trifling with the lives of the Greeks, are you not ashamed to permit a man, who has utterly shipwrecked the state, again to pilot the commonwealth?"

Here we unearth an egregious fallacy which underlies the entire plea of Æschines. Repeatedly does he conclude his processes of reasoning with the declaration that his opponent was *ὁ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλυτῆριος*, the guilty destroyer of Greece. True it was that the ship of state was wrecked with the hand of the great orator on the helm. But it does not follow that the pilot is culpable for the disaster which he exerted his utmost strength to avert. The blame may rest on a sluggish or an infatuated crew, or the disaster may have been providential. The last theory is that which Demosthenes sets up in reply. Cautious lest he should offend his fellow-citizens by criminating their credulity toward Philip when he was gaining a foothold in Greece, he charges the ill-success of the Grecian arms to *Τύχη*, the goddess of fortune. The fallacy under consideration is doing its work of falsehood in American politics whenever apologists for slavery, the cause of our national troubles, charge antislavery men with the instigation of the great rebellion. Some logicians would classify this fallacy under the head of *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*; others would more exactly denominate it as a confusion of the *occasion* with the *cause*. Paul's preaching was the occasion of the Ephesian mob, the guild of enraged jewelers was the cause; resistance to the aggressions of slavery was the occasion of the war of secession, but the madness of the blind slavemasters is the cause; the eloquence of Demosthenes was the occasion of the subversion of Grecian liberties, but Philip of Macedon was the responsible cause. But Demosthenes, not satisfied with this negative mode of defense, boldly glories in that unsuccessful resistance which had ended in the overthrow of his cherished country. Appealing to the traditional sentiment of glory and patriotism, he bears his judges, on the wings of his superhuman eloquence, up from the humiliation of defeat and ruin to the heights of exultation and pride, making each heart thrill with noble emotions at the recollection of that glorious struggle in which they had lost all but honor. As loyal Americans we may soon be in need of the very consolation which Demosthenes so elo-

quently imparts to his countrymen in the unfortunate issue of their struggle for national existence. Hear him :

I will even assert something of a paradox ; and I beg and pray you not to marvel at its boldness, but kindly to consider what I say. If, then, the results (of the war against Philip) had been fore-known to all, if all had foreseen them, and you, Æschines, had fore-told them with clamor and outcry ; you who never opened your mouth ; not even then should the commonwealth have abandoned her design if she had any regard for glory, ancestry, or futurity. As it is, she appears to have failed in her enterprise, a thing to which all mankind are liable if the Deity so wills it ; but then—claiming precedency over others, and afterward abandoning her pretensions—she would have incurred the charge of betraying all to Philip. Why, had we resigned without a struggle that which our ancestors encountered every danger to win, who would not have spit upon you ? . . . But never, never can you have made a mistake, O Athenians, in undertaking the battle for the freedom and safety of all ! I swear by your forefathers ; those that met the peril at Marathon, those that arrayed themselves at Plateæa, those in the naval battle at Salamis and those at Artemisium, and many other brave men who repose in the public tombs, *all* of whom alike, as being worthy of the same honor, the country buried, Æschines, not only the successful or victorious ! Justly ! For the duty of brave men was done by all : their fortune was such as the Deity assigned to each.

Immortal sentiments ! golden words ! worthy to be inscribed on every American patriot's heart. After the outburst of this irresistible flood of pathos we willingly pardon the withdrawing of Æschines from the tribunal, before Demosthenes had concluded his speech, and his hasty preparation for a returnless exile ; and with the judges we unanimously cast our votes for the defendant.

Throughout this entire oration of Æschines there occur instances of his inimitable power of insinuation. As an instance, we adduce an apparently trivial remark made in reference to the young man Ariston, who resided in the family of Demosthenes : *ὁ τι δὲ πράττων ἢ πάσων ἀμφίβολος ἢ αἰτία καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐδαμῶς εὐσχημον ἐμοὶ λέγειν*. By the use of that one word *πάσων* he wickedly hints at what he dares not assert and cannot prove. This facility of insinuation is a knavish art, but one often employed by unscrupulous men. The English reader will understand the gravamen of the charge thus adroitly insinuated by reference to Rom. i, 27.

On the other hand there are loud and persistent allegations of bribery, and one or two labored documentary proofs specifying names, places, dates, and the amounts of gold received by Demosthenes from foreign princes. We are surprised, in view of the heinousness of this charge against a public man, that there is not the least notice taken of it in the reply—a circumstance which the judges and all succeeding generations have construed into a proof of innocence, on the principle that “the wounded bird always flutters.”

There are occasionally witty hits at Demosthenes. He is compared to a bugle, from which, if the mouthpiece be taken away, there is nothing left; and his coronation is burlesqued by being likened to the imaginary crowning of Thersites, the Homeric clown, amid the hissing of the Greeks. But the ridicule of Æschines generally fails because it is directed toward the wrong object. There are men who dwell in regions too high to be reached by the shafts of derision, men of unbending moral purpose and heroic sacrifice. No man ever triumphed by the use of this weapon against Washington, though there were not wanting fools who hurled this missile at the father of his country. Men of crooked antecedents and glaring inconsistencies of conduct are exposed to this species of warfare. The venal orator finds only two foibles in the character of his opponent. The first is his “dealing in the marvelous,” his pretense of intimacy with the gods for the purpose of securing an influence over the people. But this was not the most appropriate subject for ridicule in a city whose inhabitants were pronounced by St. Paul to be *δεισδαίμονες*. The other alleged foible was cowardice, based upon his conduct in the battle of Chæronea. This is repeated by Æschines with every variation possible to a malicious ingenuity. Perhaps the persistence with which this scoffer stings his rival for his flight from the field, has given rise to the prevalent opinion that the orator and the soldier are incompatible characters—an opinion contradicted on almost every page of history, and also on the last page of the annals of America, where in letters of blood is penned the disaster of Ball’s Bluff, and the death of the golden-mouthed orator of Oregon. The conduct of Demosthenes in yielding to the invincible Macedonian veterans, after a most desperate struggle, is no more dishonorable than the retreat of

Charles XII. from the lost field of Pultowa, or of Washington from the battle of Germantown, or of Napoleon from Waterloo. Probably many of the judges before whom Æschines was pleading were implicated in the same charge, if it is cowardice to survive a defeat. Here we mark another cause of failure, *misapplied ridicule*.

He is exceedingly unfortunate also in his peroration. It is overstrained and pretentious, and justly called down the scathing derision of his opponent. It is a good illustration of the art of sinking; for the period immediately preceding is the most remarkable in the whole oration, mounting to the very summit of eloquence. With the art of a master he throws upon the canvas an imaginary picture. We see standing on the bench the revered national fathers and benefactors, Solon, whose oath was upon the lips of the judges, and Aristides, trusted by all the Greeks to assess their taxes, earnestly protesting against such a dishonorable act as the placing of a golden crown on the head of one who has enriched himself by the taking of bribes; and we hear Themistocles and the martyrs of Marathon and Plataea, and the very tombs of the forefathers, groaning over the degeneracy of that generation which should bestow a crown upon the man who had plotted with barbarians against the Grecian State.

We have already pointed out some causes of the signal defeat of Æschines in this celebrated contest. We call attention to another. His failure is attributable to his *lack of a noble purpose*. True persuasion must be the outgushing of a soul full of generous impulses, the communication to another of that fire first enkindled in the speaker's own breast. Aristotle enumerates three qualities which the speaker must possess in order to impress the minds of hearers favorably: good principle, good sense, and good will. These must constitute the *ἦθος τοῦ λέγοντος*. Æschines made a capital failure in the first principle, for his *animus* is manifestly an intense hatred of his great political enemy, whom he strives to smite and to destroy. To accomplish this he must imbue the dicasts with the feeling which rankles in his own bosom. He must set in array and magnify his rival's misdeeds; he must lay bare his villainy, and shower scorn upon his meanness. But if the denunciation is plainly undeserved, a sense of injured justice is awakened in

the hearer in behalf of the object of the wrong, and the philippic, overcharged with acrimony, defeats its own purpose, as an overdose of poison is ejected by its victim. The malignity of Æschines leads him to exaggerate the faults of his opponent to such a point that there is a reaction in the minds of his readers, as there probably was, in a greater degree, in the minds of his hearers. On the other hand, Demosthenes, inspired by devotion to the "good principles" of patriotism and love of liberty, appeals to similar sentiments in his judges, without danger of any damaging rebound of the excess of emotion which he may excite. We do not assert that the victorious advocate in this trial does not exhibit strong animosity toward his assailant, nor do we deny that his thunderbolts were sped to their mark by the impetus of wrath—for even the pious Luther confesses that he was the most eloquent when most angry—but we claim that his triumph resulted from an appeal to the nobler sensibilities of his judges. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that both of these orators blot their speeches with disgusting scurrility. Æschines vilifies his antagonist, who repays him in his own coin.

ART. VI.—COLENSO ON THE PENTATEUCH.

The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua Critically Examined. * By the Right Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D. D., Bishop of Natal. * 12mo., pp. 229. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1863.*

THE author of this work, it will be perceived, is a colonial or missionary prelate of the Church of England, in charge of one of the South African sees. He began his literary career by the publication of several mathematical treatises, which were well received by the English public. He also put forth some four or five smaller devotional works, and more recently a new translation and exposition of the Epistle to the Romans, written "from a missionary point of view;" which evinces a wide

* Our own strictures upon this work were written before the appearance of Prof. Mahan's answer to it, which forcibly—though sarcastically—exposes its fallacious point of view, but mostly leaves to other hands the task of refuting its errors in detail.

departure from the orthodox views on the subject of Christian justification, little calculated, one would think, to promote the conversion of heathen. The bishop will also be remembered as having ventured some time since a strange opinion, that pagan polygamists on embracing Christianity are not under obligation to renounce any of their wives. The present volume, which is Part One of a proposed series on the Old (and apparently also the New) Testament in the same spirit of "critical examination," gives similar unmistakable evidence of an attempt to accommodate at once the objections of English neology and Zulu unbelief. The author, in his preface and introduction, (which occupy about one sixth of the entire work, in matters almost exclusively personal,) *naively* tells us how he has come to be involved in these critical difficulties, which have at length brought him to the bold step of committing himself to the public avowal of his belief in "THE UNHISTORICAL CHARACTER" of the Mosaic narrative. By this assertion, however, which he does not definitely explain, it would seem (see note on page 16) that he does not wish to charge upon "the writer of the story of the Exodus, from the ancient legends of his people," any "*conscious dishonesty or intention to deceive*;" but whether the writer in question was himself so thoroughly convinced of the fabulous character of his materials as to take it for granted that his readers would be equally able to perceive their "unhistorical character," (how woefully in that case was he mistaken!) or by what other piece of casuistry he contrived to justify himself in this pious fraud, Dr. Colenso does not deign nor trouble himself to inform us, or even to conjecture. That this writer, quietly assumed to be unknown, was nevertheless not Moses, appears quite plain to the author; and it is worth while to observe, as indicating the *animus* that lies behind the present "critical examination," the manner in which he anticipates (pages 30-32) the argument for the authenticity of the Mosaic history, drawn from its citation *as such* in the New Testament; for example, John vi, 46, 47; Luke xx, 37; xvi, 29, 31; where our Saviour explicitly declares that Moses wrote the account of the incidents referred to. Bishop Colenso thinks he obviates this impeachment of our Lord's veracity by replying in substance thus: First, the narrative in question was not really part of the Pentateuch as written by Moses.

Second, its acknowledgment as an integral portion of Moses's writings by our Lord was merely an expression of the universal belief of those times. Third, our Lord had no definite knowledge on the subject whatever. We despair of framing logic like this into a regular syllogism, so as to show whether the fallacy lies in the major or minor premiss, or in the deduction: the nearest parallel we remember to have heard to such reasoning was the answer of the boy, who, upon being charged with breaking his fellow's knife, rejoined, "Why, I never had it; besides, it was broken when I borrowed it; and more than that, it was whole when I gave it back."

As to his attack upon the credibility of the Mosaic narrative, we feel under no apprehension for the issue, whatever temporary alarm he may occasion in good minds, or damage he may do to the unstable. The Bible as a whole, and in all its parts, has survived too many onsets of secret as well as open foes, to be in any serious danger from objectors at this late day. Many of the difficulties adduced by Colenso are old ones raked together from German sources, and have been answered time and again. He is especially fond of mathematical problems, and harps greatly upon the alleged exaggerated numbers presented in the biblical history. These large sums (occurring not only in the Pentateuch, but in later books) have by no means been observed now for the first time; they have been pointed out and explained more or less by nearly every critic and expositor of ancient or modern times.* The Jews were not unaware of them, but the Masorites were too conscientiously scrupulous of the integrity of the text to attempt to remove them. A large proportion of such are evidently simply *clerical errors* that cannot now be corrected except conjecturally, inasmuch as the original sources of information have long since perished; others of these alleged statistical discrepancies are purely imaginary, being represented as such merely through the capitiousness, ignorance, or want of investigation of the objector himself. Nothing is easier than to raise difficult questions in connection with events and documents of so great antiquity as the biblical records; the wonder is, not that so many points remain obscure and unexplained, but that so many collateral

* See especially Winer's *Biblisches Real-wörterbuch*, s. v. Zahlen. Colenso has paraded most of the examples of this sort on page 207 of his work.

evidences are still extant to vouch for the truthfulness of the history, and that every year brings fresh light upon the dark passages. The friends of the Bible do not shrink in the least from the closest scrutiny and comparison of its statements which the present or any other work may challenge. We believe that a reasonable solution can be offered of every one of the difficulties hitherto advanced. But even should we not be able to present an immediate and satisfactory answer to every hard question, however frivolous it may seem to us to be, which this or that Momus may see fit to propound, we do not thereby feel our confidence disturbed, but should yet consider it the height of rashness to fly to the alternative of rejecting the historical character of these venerable documents. We now address ourselves cheerfully to the task of divesting, so far as space will allow, the way of the sacred student of these bugbears that have been raised by the pious researches of Bishop Colenso and his colleagues. We take them up in the order in which he adduces them.*

1. *Hezron and Hamul, the sons of Pharez, and grandsons of Judah, could not have been among the seventy members of Jacob's family born in Canaan, who went down with him into Egypt, (Genesis xli, 12;) because Judah himself was at that time only forty-two years old, (Genesis xli, 46, compared with xxix, 35; xxx, 24-26; xxxi, 41.)*† We answer:

(1.) Nevertheless, it is actually possible that such was the case. Many a man has become a grandfather at forty-two years of age, and in Eastern countries we know that persons of both sexes are marriageable very early. It is evident also from the history itself that the series of marriages and births in this case took place in the most rapid succession. Nor is it necessary to

* In a few of the following replies to Bishop Colenso's objections, we shall content ourselves with condensing the explanations given by a writer in the *British Quarterly Review* for January, 1863. An examination of Colenso's book of a very different character appears in the *National Review* (London) for January, 1863, in which the writer flippantly enumerates the difficulties, without attempting their investigation, and merely sneers at the bishop's simplicity in advancing some of them; he then goes on, in a deistical vein, to adduce other "contradictions" in the Mosaic narrative; but they are of too trivial a character to be worth refuting here in detail, as he finally admits, "These are not important inconsistencies; they impair very slightly the value of the narrative."

† Dr. Colenso does not make a point specially of the mode in which this number of descendants is made up, and therefore we also pass it by.

conclude from the order of the narrative (Genesis xxxvii, 2) that Judah was not himself married till he became twenty years old. Supposing he was but fifteen when his third son Shelah was born, (some of them perhaps being twins,) and that Tamar's incest occurred in the latter's fourteenth year, (when his neglect of her would become apparent,) we have still thirteen years left for the birth of the sons of Pharez, (who may also have been twins.) It may be said these are mere suppositions, and not probable ones either. That is not the point. In a discussion like the present, where the dates in detail are not given, we have a right to make any arrangement of them, provided it be barely possible, which will satisfy the conditions of the chronology; nor has any man a right to deny the "historical character" of the narrative, unless he can prove that any such adjustment whatever is utterly impossible. He may deem the circumstances unusual, or even unlikely, and so may style them "certainly incredible," if he pleases; but so would have been many other undoubted facts in daily life, unless the particulars had been afforded.

(2.) It appears that the genealogical list in question was made up at the time of Jacob's death, seventeen years later, (Gen. xlvii, 28,) when there is no difficulty in believing that Judah had grandsons. This is evident to us from the facts (*a*) that in the hurry and confusion of a migration like that of Jacob's family, no minute list of this sort would be likely to be thought of; whereas, upon the patriarch's decease, when perhaps these very members of his lineage were the exact ones gathered to his obsequies, it would be eminently in place; (see Gen. i, 8;) (*b*) that the same names occur in the parallel lists of Exodus i, 1-5; vi, 14, 15; (verses 16-25 are from a different source, showing the personal descent of Moses and Aaron;) Numbers xxvi, 5-49, (except that the sons of Eliab are specified in verse 9 to show the descent of Korah, and that Ohad is accidentally omitted among the sons of Simeon in verse 12, while the descendants of Joseph are detailed in verses 28-37, and those of Benjamin in 38-41,) which all relate to a later date than the removal to Egypt; (*c*) that there is evidence of other great grandsons of Jacob in this list, (Gen. xlvii, 8-27,) some of whom at least could not well have been born prior to the demise of that patriarch, namely, [*i*] Eliab, the son of Pallu,

(Num. xxvi, 8,) whose name appears to have slipped out of the list of Reuben's family, (on which supposition we avoid the necessity of including Jacob himself among his own posterity in the number seventy,) and [ii] especially among the sons of Benjamin, (verse 21,) we find Gera, and Naaman, and Ard or Addar, who were sons of Bela, (1 Chron. viii, 3, 4,) and Muppim, (namely, Shuppim, or Shuphan, etc.,) and Huppim, (that is, Huphan, Num. xxvi, 39,) the son of Ir, (1 Chron. vii, 12,) that is, perhaps of Becher, (for the name does not appear elsewhere in the lists,) also [iii] Heber and Malchiel, the grandsons of Asher, (verse 17;) finally (*d*) that the list in Genesis cannot be dated very much later than the migration to Egypt, for it does not contain the name of Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, (born in Egypt in her father's old age, however, Num. xxvi, 59,) nor of Zabdi, or Zimri, son of the twin brother of Pharez, (Josh. vii, 1; 1 Chron. ii, 6,) not to mention other great grandsons of Jacob, (Num. xxvi, 29-36.) We thus avoid Colenso's objections to Hengstenberg's solution of the difficulty, namely, that the questionable descendants are spoken of *proleptically*, as being "already in the loins of their father" Jacob at the time of the descent into Egypt; as well as Colenso's question why, on the supposition that the list was made up of such descendants as were family heads, the other great grandsons of Jacob were not included in it: the reason for the insertion of some and the omission of others was not, (as he assumes, page 69,) "plainly because the former are supposed to have been born in the land of Canaan, and the latter not," (for then the sons of Joseph born in Egypt, verse 29, would likewise have been omitted,) but because they were not born at the time the list was originally made. True, the sacred writer, both in Genesis and in Exodus, (i, 1,) uses the expression, "these are the names of the children of Israel, *which came into Egypt*;" but Dr. Colenso, as a professed exegete, ought to know better than to stickle (p. 61) for a nicety of this kind in phraseology, especially when the context itself expressly mentions children that had never journeyed to Egypt at all, but were born there. Indeed, he elsewhere admits (p. 67) that "the narrative lays no stress whatever on the mere fact of their 'coming to' Egypt, in the case of Joseph's sons, as if they had come because their father had come. The fact of

their being born in Egypt, or rather *being* in Egypt, at this time, is all that the writer takes account of." Yet with characteristic captiousness he immediately proceeds to find fault with the sacred writer, that, "though wishing to sum up the seventy souls under one category, he uses (inaccurately, as he himself admits) the same expression, 'came into Egypt.'" The language here is not an admission of *inaccuracy*, but is simply "epexegetical," or explanatory of the writer's own meaning.*

We have entered into the minutiae of this topic, not because we deem it particularly important to the truthfulness of the Pentateuch in general to prove that this or that name in a list contained in it stands there with mathematical precision; but because it is a case representative of a class of difficulties which we admit to be somewhat (and necessarily so) frequent in the Bible records. Oriental history has always been largely based upon genealogical accounts, that have in many cases been current orally for ages before being reduced to writing. (The Hebrew word for *history*, in fact, is דִּבְרֵי יָמִים, "generations," that is, pedigree.) Hence, there have unavoidably arisen discrepancies, omissions, or redundancies in the details, which the annalist who employed the materials did not feel called upon in his day to rectify, even if he had possessed (as he frequently did

* In the same carping spirit Dr. Colenso adds: "So he sums up, inaccurately, Jacob himself, as one of the 'seventy souls' among his *children* in verse 8: 'These are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt, Jacob and his sons.' And he includes him again among the sons of Leah in verse 15: 'All the souls of his sons and his daughters were thirty and three,' which they would not be without reckoning Jacob, as mentioned in verse 8." How sharp is the ex-tutor of Harrow in grammar as well as in arithmetic! Yet he is not able to see how the words, "Jacob and his sons," in one of the verses in question can be parsed without making the sacred penman guilty of the absurdity of saying that Jacob was one of his own sons, nor to add up the numbers in the other without involving the equal absurdity of calling Jacob one of the sons of Leah. Perhaps it will relieve his love of exactitude in science if we suggest that the obnoxious words in verse 8 may be regarded as parenthetically thrown in to express the fact that Jacob came along with his sons, while our suggestion of the clerical oversight of the name of Eliab, the son of Pallu, among the sons of Reuben, may excuse Jacob from personally standing in place of his missing descendant. Dr. Colenso, in a foot-note, (p. 67,) is about to correct the use of the word "daughters" in the verse last quoted, reminding the writer that Jacob had but one daughter, Dinah; but he suddenly recollects that "the Hebrew idiom allows of [a schoolmaster who raps Moses so unmercifully over the knuckles for faults of style, ought to have been more careful in his own English than to use this superfluity] this" use of language, and he forbears. *Hebrew idiom!* Why did he not say, *common sense?*

not) the means of doing so with certainty. It was sufficient for his purpose that their accuracy, to all the uses and intents had in view, was generally acknowledged by those among whom he lived, and for whose benefit he wrote; for him to have made corrections in them would have really weakened the authority of his annals, while to have introduced discussions of their minute parts would have exhibited a finical pedantry utterly foreign to the spirit of those simple ages. He inserted them just as they had been handed down, without either questioning or vouching for their unessential particulars. How preposterous then is it to expect modern believers in the Bible to ferret out and explain, at this far distant time, the petty inaccuracies which keen-eyed skeptics detect, or fancy they detect, in these documents! If this is the way in which Dr. Colenso intends to proceed through the Holy Scriptures, we warrant him beforehand that he will be able to find plenty of flaws in the numbers, dates, and names with which these writings abound, not only in the Pentateuch and Joshua, but still more copiously in Kings, Chronicles, and even in the genealogies of the New Testament, with which to cram his future volumes. We warn him also that the public will probably reward him at last as Apollo did the critic, who, having dedicated to the god of letters the faults which he had discovered in a poem, was set to the task of culling out all the kernels of wheat from a sack of newly-threshed grain, and was finally presented with the *chaff* for his pains.

2. *The space at "the door of the Tabernacle"* (estimated at eighteen feet wide) *was entirely too small to contain "all the congregation of the children of Israel,"* (supposing only the six hundred thousand males fit for war to be intended,) *who are repeatedly stated to have been gathered there.* (Lev. viii, 1-4; Exod. xii, 6; xxi, 2, 3; Num. xiv, 5; i, 18; Lev. xxiv, 14; Num. xv, 36; xvi, 19, 25, 47; x, 3, 4.) Nor, we venture to assert, can an intelligent Sunday-school child be found who imagines that this mass of persons were ever expected to assemble within this limited compass. Of course as many as possible crowded into the place appointed, and the rest got as near as they could. But the author insists, "As the text says distinctly, 'at the door of the tabernacle,' they must have come *within the court,*" which was itself only some ninety feet

broad. Accordingly, he has no difficulty in making out an absolute impossibility in the case.

Allowing two feet in width for each full-grown man, nine men could just have stood in front of it. Supposing then that "all the congregation" of adult males in the prime of life had given due heed to the divine summons, and had hastened to take their stand side by side, as closely as possible, in front, not merely of the *door*, but of the whole *end* of the tabernacle, in which the door was, they would have reached, allowing eighteen inches between each rank of nine men, for a distance of more than one hundred thousand feet, in fact, nearly *twenty miles*!

He then goes on to show, by means of a similar nice calculation, that neither the entire space within the court in front of the tabernacle, nor, in fine, the whole court itself, could have held any considerable fraction of the people. Of course not; and neither Jehovah, who gave the directions for the assemblages in question, nor Moses, who published them, could have supposed that anybody would so understand the requirement. The multitude would take a common-sense view of the order, and assemble as best they might, just as every reader spontaneously regards the occurrence to have taken place. Does Dr. Colenso deem the writer of the Pentateuch to have been, not only a knave in attempting to palm off an absurdity upon the world, but also a fool in meaning to say that the total populace, or anything like it, was absolutely crowded within these dimensions, or in expecting his readers to believe him if he did? The whole objection is so frivolous and quibbling that we hardly think it worth while to refute it formally; yet, lest we should be charged with remissness, we will examine it a little further. In the first place, then, we observe that out of all the passages which Colenso cites on this point there are but *two* occasions named in which it is expressly stated that *all* the congregation was gathered or required to assemble at the spot in question. In the next place, it was very easy to enlarge the area in front of the tabernacle on such special occasions by removing or spreading apart the curtain-walls of the court inclosing that structure. In the third place, all who were assembled *in view* of the designated place, however far or wide the concourse should extend, might and would properly be said to have met there, or to have complied with the terms of the summons. Finally, it is not necessary to assume that

anything like the whole number summoned were actually present. Those who conveniently could, who chose, or who were able to be first on the ground, gathered there; and as all were invited, they represented the rest. Similar meetings are of constant occurrence, even with us, and are spoken of in precisely similar terms. A town meeting or mass meeting is called in front of some public building, in village or city; and although not a tithe or hundredth part of the inhabitants can get anywhere near the spot, much less reach the entrance, or indeed ever think of attending at all, nevertheless, the proceedings are announced as the public act of the population at large, without counting or considering who took a personal and direct share in them.

The same answer may be given to Colenso's next and analogous objection, that Moses and Joshua could not possibly have spoken or read before all the congregation, including the women, children, and strangers, (Deut. i, 1; v, 1; Josh. viii, 34, 35.) Here, however, there is really no impossibility at all. Moses or Joshua might easily *speak or read before* any conceivable multitude; that is, he might utter the words in their presence. If it had been said that absolutely all these individuals were actually assembled *at one time* within the sound of his *single* voice, then, we grant, the statement would have been incredible and untrue. Dr. Colenso indeed seeks to impose this meaning upon the text;* but it is not in fact there, nor does the language used fairly imply it. The tables are turned upon the objector, and we

* He says: "It may be said, indeed, that only a portion of this great host was really present, though 'all Israel' is spoken of. [Note the vagueness of this expression.] And this might have been allowed [mark the admission] without derogating from the general historical value of the book, [Why then introduce this as one of the grand objections to its "historical character?"] though, of course, not without impeaching the *literal* accuracy of the Scripture narrative, which by some is so strenuously maintained. [It is rather the truthfulness of the *facts* and language, *popularly* understood, that is generally contended for.] But the words above quoted from Joshua are so comprehensive that they will not allow of [*sic*] this. [On the contrary, such appears to us to be their natural and only common-sense interpretation.] We must suppose [for nothing of the kind is directly asserted] that, at least, the great body of the congregation was present, [which may have been true,] and not only present, but able to hear the words of awful moment which Joshua addressed to them, [though none but a madman could have intended to assert this of two millions of persons.] Nor can it be supposed that he read them first to one party and then to another, etc., till 'all the congregation' had heard them." [But the elders may have assisted him in thus repeating the words.]

have a right to demand that one who is so technical and exact in holding others to the explicit terms of passages, shall himself adhere strictly to what is written. But we do not insist upon this. Every attentive and considerate reader will understand these statements of the sacred writer in the sense above vindicated; just as a whole community is often said to have turned out to hear a noted speaker, although comparatively few may be able to get access to the room; or (still more analogously) as a preacher may properly be said to have addressed innumerable multitudes in the open air, when only those within a moderate distance of the stand could have distinguished his words. (Compare Mark ii, 2.) Moreover, Moses and Joshua had the seventy elders at hand, who doubtless contributed materially to the dissemination of what was uttered.

3. *The camp was so great in extent that it must have been impossible for the priests to reach its outskirts in order to carry away the offal of the sacrifices, (Lev. iv, 11, 12,) or for the people to perform the daily necessities of life, (Deut. xxiii, 12-14.)* The author estimates that two millions of people closely packed together would cover three square miles, or if less uncomfortably crowded, they would occupy an area of twelve miles square. In either case the priest would be unable to travel daily from the center to the circumference with the entire carcass (flesh, head, limbs, skin, entrails, and all) of the bullocks required to be sacrificed and then burned without the camp as a sin-offering for individual offenses. We opine that it would require an extraordinarily able-bodied man for a priest, if he had to carry such a load but once and for a few rods' distance only. It is wonderful that the idea did not occur to so acute a thinker as Dr. Colenso, that *the priest might employ others to carry it for him!* (The word used is *אָזַח*, literally, *cause to go forth*, but spoken of bringing out in general, though not necessarily, of course, with one's own hand; see Gen. viii, 17. The priest was at liberty to obtain all the assistance he required or saw fit to deputize.) He certainly would be obliged to do so whether the camp was large or small. The regulation as to the disposal of human ordure obviously applied (as the text itself shows) only to the armed males, and was sufficiently fulfilled by a withdrawal to some retired spot; in a word, it was the usual sanitary order for soldiers and not for families. Our right rev-

erend author's objections are becoming something below the frivolous.

4. "*It is surprising*" that the number of adult males who paid the poll-tax (half a shekel, after the shekel of the sanctuary, Exod. xxx, 12-14,) for the construction of the tabernacle and its vessels, (Exod. xxviii, 26,) *should have been identically the same* (603,550) as it was when the census was taken after the erection of the tabernacle, (Num. i, 46.) The author has to labor hard in order to make out any great point of difficulty here at all.* We will frame our reply in such a manner as to avoid the objections which he raises to the solutions of Kurtz and others.

(1.) It would have been still more surprising if after so short an interval† the numbers had varied considerably. Dr. Colenso would doubtless in that case have brought precisely this opposite complaint against the sacred writer, that he had contradicted his own statistics.

(2.) *The figures tally because the two events were coincident.* That the number of the tax-payers was taken from the sum in the poll-list is not only obvious from their exact correspondence, but it is also apparent from the facts and phraseology of the narrative. Moses, while on the Mount, was commanded, "*When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel, then shall they give,*" etc., (Exod. xxx, 12.) Accordingly we read that there was collected "*half a shekel for every one that went to be num-*

*The author criticises Moses for using the phrase "shekel of the sanctuary," before the tabernacle was erected. His exception would be better taken, were he able himself to inform us what difference in value this peculiar epithet made in the coin or weight in question. It is a pure assumption on his part that the term had its origin in the usages of the tabernacle cultus. It may have been a distinction borrowed from the Egyptian temples, where the standards of the priestly caste may naturally have differed from "government weight," like the modern variations of *Troy, avoirdupois, and apothecaries' weight*. (Compare the different lengths of the sacred and common *cubit*.) Or it may have grown out of some unknown observance connected with the Hebrew form of worship already established.

†The hypercritical author is inexact in his own "historical" statements. He asserts that the census took place "half a year after" the half-shekel assessment. The former occurred on the first day of the second month in the second year after the Exodus, (Num. i, 18,) that is, about the first of May; the latter was ordered during Moses's first stay of forty days on Sinai, which must have been, not "six or seven months before," but about June or July previous; while of its completion no date whatever prior to the census is recorded, for reasons that will presently appear.

bered" of the 603,550 adult males, (Exod. xxxviii, 26.) At what time, then, were they numbered? Evidently at the census spoken of in Num. i, where the same sum total occurs; *nor is any other numbering alluded to.* But was there no list kept of those who paid? Unquestionably there was, and we have it incorporated into the report of the number common to both transactions; for each referred to the same class of persons, the male Israelites above twenty years of age.* Still, how could the silver contributed be used for the construction of the sanctuary, unless the collection had been completed previously? The collection of the money and the fabrication of the tabernacle no doubt went on at the same time, as is always the case in public works; and it was foreseen that the enrollment would at length be required in order to ascertain who were in arrears and enforce payment. Thus the two proceedings naturally came out together, and identical numbers resulted.†

5. *Whence could the Israelites have so suddenly procured tents* (Exod. xvi, 16) *and arms* (Exod. xiii, 18) *for such a vast host?* The author expatiates upon the difficulty of providing accommodations and weapons for an army incomparably less than

* The entire argument of Dr. Colenso really pertinent to this subject is contained in the following sentence, which after all he ventures only to throw into an interrogative or conjectural form: "Is there any reasonable ground for supposing that the number of those who contributed the silver for the building of the sanctuary would not have been noted and remembered as accurately as that of those of whom the census was taken?" His whole fallacy lies in imagining that the transactions were separate in time, independent in connection, and that distinct accounts were kept of each; whereas they were intimately connected throughout, were in fact simultaneous in their final execution, and the records of their results were mutually compared and verified, having doubtless passed through the hands of the same officers.

† As the relative value of the "talent" and half-shekel can only be estimated from the passage in question, (Exod. xxxviii, 25-28,) we have no means of determining whether the silver applied to the construction of the 100 "sockets," and other fixtures of the tabernacle as there related, was derived exclusively from the tax under consideration. We may imagine that coin (supposing this to have been of Egyptian mintage) would not be melted down for this purpose until all the bullion of the profuse popular voluntary offerings (among which silver is expressly mentioned, Exod. xxxv, 5, 24) was exhausted. It would seem that this latter was employed in casting the first 60 sockets for the exterior inclosure of the tabernacle, (Exod. xxxvi, 24-36,) so that but a part (the spontaneous payments) of the tax-fund would be required for the remaining 40 sockets of the interior structure. The balance, when collected at the final census, would replace the bullion contributions with coin for other or future expenses. These minute comparisons show that the sacred narrative will bear the closest inspection.

they are stated to have formed; and we Americans just now know something of the embarrassments to which even government resources are subjected in such emergencies. We suggest, however, several considerations that seem to us to relieve the narrative of incredibility on this score.

(1.) It is not necessary to suppose (for the language of the text does not expressly say this) that every family was furnished with a tent, or every soldier with complete armor; many no doubt, especially at first, were but sorrily equipped. The narrative indeed all along implies that they expected, were willing to undergo, nay, actually experienced many inconveniences, privations, and hardships of this sort. We must by no means measure the accommodations of this nature required by a well-appointed army of our own time and country, with the proverbially scanty stock of furniture and outfit of an ancient Oriental. Especially would a people originally and essentially nomadic (notwithstanding their partial domiciliation in Goshen) find these matters the most trivial obstacles to their removal. In Egypt, where no rain ever falls, persons of all ages and conditions habitually sleep out of doors, and the acclimated Israelites, of course, were prepared to do the same until they should have an opportunity to fit up tents. As to weapons, they were far from being the unarmed slaves which the author holds them to have been; and even if they had been, their Egyptian neighbors were at last but too eager to get rid of them (Exod. xii, 31-36) to withhold from them as many of these as they wished.

(2.) The Hebrews were not only traditionally looking for a return from Egypt during this generation, (Gen. xv, 13, 14; i, 24,) for which they must therefore have been somewhat preparing; but during several preceding weeks they had been earnestly anticipating a release, while Moses was contending with the tyrant for their deliverance. In fact they had been expressly warned some days before to have all their goods packed and everything ready for starting on a given signal, the death of the first-born of their oppressors.

This last named circumstance obviates another of our author's difficulties,* that "the story" allows "one single day,

* Economy of room, as well as logical continuity, requires us to consider under one head cognate objections which Colenso expands, as if for effect, through several (not always consecutive) chapters.

rather *twelve hours*" only for all this immense preparation to be made, and especially for the enormous number of lambs to be dressed and eaten in the individual residences of the Israelites, scattered throughout the entire extent of the land of Goshen, involving likewise the necessity of sundry notices circulated separately to each person. Had the bishop read with a little more attention the narrative which he so harshly judges, he would have perceived that the order communicated through Moses to select the paschal lamb on the *tenth* day of the month, (Exod. xii, 3,) must have been accompanied with such explanations as to what was about to occur on the *fourteenth* and following day as would not only be a sufficient intimation to the elders and people to hold themselves in readiness against the crisis of the wonderful scenes at the time transpiring, but induce them to arrange all the details of the passover and ensuing flight. It is true, the chapter in which this premonition is found comes in after the threat of the final catastrophe to the Egyptians at midnight of the same day on which it was *publicly* denounced; but this is done merely in order not to break the continuity of the account of the plagues by this statement, which would also be thereby severed from its connection with the actual observance of the festival, as related in an orderly manner in verse 21, etc. They thus had four or five days' warning, under circumstances powerfully conducive to their expeditious preparation.

The same reasoning applies to the author's warm protest against the rapid and importune exit and traveling of the motley concourse of men, women, and children, flocks and herds, out into the arid, foodless desert for several consecutive days under all these disadvantages.* That the march was a forced

* "Remembering, as I do, the confusion in my own small household of thirty or forty persons when once we were obliged to fly at dead of night—having been roused from our beds with a false alarm, that an invading Zulu force had entered the colony, had evaded the English troops sent to meet them, and was making its way direct for our station, killing right and left as it came along—I do not hesitate to declare this statement to be utterly incredible and impossible." Calmer readers, however, not troubled with the nightmare recollection of such a fright, have had no hesitation for thousands of years in regarding this whole history as perfectly natural and trustworthy. The bishop himself does not seem to think the two incidents quite parallel; yet, it would appear, his domestic establishment succeeded on the instant in making good their escape. His graphic reminiscence tells against his own argument.

one, is manifest on the face of the account; and that it was attended with much confusion and individual annoyance, no one is disposed to deny. That it was possible, however, has been attested by not a few wholesale desertions of home and household comforts by the inhabitants of large districts in ancient and modern times under the pressure of great emergencies. Not to recite the speedy irruption, and as hasty decampment of Oriental hordes spoken of in history, the avalanches of Goths and Huns, the successive surges of crusaders, the invading beives of Mongols; we may refer to a recent instance in point nearer home—the expeditious stampede of the citizens of Beaufort *en masse* when the “Yankee” gunboats hove in sight. Bishop Colenso and his kindred gentry of Great Britain may possibly be incredulous of the fact that their aristocratic congeners of the South could have vacated the premises thus incontinently, “bag and baggage,” at so short a notice; but to us it is a striking illustration of the “incredible” alacrity with which the *servile population* (such he deems them) of Goshen might (*à fortiori*) have poured forth, at the command and providential preparation of Jehovah, toward the land of freedom.

7. *How could the immense flocks and herds of the Israelites have subsisted in the wilderness?* This is Dr. Colenso’s constantly recurring objection when all other methods of disproving the Mosaic narrative fail. How numerous these sheep and goats were, the narrative itself, to be sure, does not state; but this eminent arithmetician is never at a loss for figures, and so he computes, on the basis of one male firstling as a paschal lamb for every family of fifteen persons out of the two million souls of the Hebrew population, that they must have had at least two millions of sheep, and cattle in proportion, (that is, we suppose, *ad libitum*.) He then quotes travelers’ descriptions of the utter sterility of the region through which the Exodus lay,* and triumphantly declares the impossibility of foddering or watering all these beasts, especially among the bleak mountains of Sinai, where they are represented to have been herded for

*For this purpose he cites canon Stanley in particular, on the presumption that he doubtless cannot be suspected of unduly favoring the scriptural account. In this case, however, the bishop is obliged to combat in detail the arguments of one who has been on the ground, and gives the results of personal observation. We are not aware of any traveler or writer familiar with Oriental pasturage who has disputed the narrative on this ground.

nearly a year. Now were we of the author's mathematical turn of belief, we might justly dismiss this whole calculation as being conjectural in its premises, and uncertain in all its steps; but we will simply call attention to two or three other assumptions in it which wholly vitiate its conclusion.

(1.) The lambs in question for the first passover in Goshen may readily have been procured of the Egyptians, and those for the second paschal celebration could have been obtained from the same or other surrounding regions. For,

(2.) It is a fact to which travelers generally allude, that large numbers of sheep are pastured to this day by the Arabs of this and the neighboring countries. Since,

(3.) There are numerous comparatively fertile spots scattered throughout this peninsula, (see Deuteronomy x, 7,) and more would doubtless be discovered were its interior fully explored, although the route usually pursued by travelers is for most of the year represented as generally barren. And,

(4.) It is not to be imagined that these flocks and herds were kept penned up in the immediate proximity of the camp; they were unquestionably dispersed, as is the modern practice in eastern countries, over the face of the whole territory, in charge of shepherds and herdsmen, who roved from place to place in search of pasturage, but kept up communication with the central encampment.*

* A writer in the *London Athenæum*, who has himself traveled in Palestine, meets Colenso's objection in the same way:

The *second point* supposed to "demonstrate" an error in the sacred narrative is the estimated size of the camp in the wilderness: "not much inferior in compass, we must suppose, to London." It is assumed that the whole two millions of people were grouped close together in a camp. This is opposed alike to the whole tenor of the narrative and to common sense. Any one who has had an opportunity of visiting the great Arab tribes of the Syrian desert can see that the bishop's difficulties are here purely imaginary. The Israelites had immense flocks and herds, (Exod. xii, 38;) these, from the necessity of the case, and like the flocks of the modern Bedawin, were scattered far and wide over the peninsula, and probably over the plain northward. On one occasion I rode for two successive days in a straight line through the flocks of a section of the Anazeh tribe, and the encampment of the chief was then at a noted fountain thirty miles distant at right angles to my course; yet the country was swarming with men and women, boys and girls, looking after the cattle. In like manner the great bulk of the Israelites would be scattered over the desert. The camp would thus be a mere nucleus; large, no doubt, but not approaching the exaggerated estimate of Bishop Colenso. Yet, being the headquarters of the nation, containing the tabernacle, the priests and the chiefs, and forming the rallying-point for the warriors, it was the only place with which the sacred historian was concerned. This view, which is natural, scriptural, and in accordance with the universal practice of Oriental nomads, sweeps away a host of difficulties conjured up by the imagination and then supported by the arithmetic of Bishop Colenso.

7. *The number of the immigrants was disproportioned to the extent of the country to be possessed; much less was there any danger of their not being able to hold the wild beasts in check,* (Exod. xxiii, 29.) It is sufficient to reply:

(1.) The grant of territory to the Israelites properly extended from the confines of Egypt to the borders of Asia Minor, and from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, (Gen. xv, 18; Exod. xxiii, 31; Deut. xi, 24;) and this was the actual extent of the empire under David and Solomon.

(2.) The population of Canaan proper or Palestine appears in later times to have greatly exceeded that of the Canaanites and original Israelites combined; and it is probable that it is capable at the present day of supporting an equal number of inhabitants.

(3.) Nevertheless, we frequently read of the ravages of wild animals in the scriptural history, (for example: 2 Kings ii, 24; Judg. xiv, 5; 2 Sam. xxiii, 20; 1 Kings xiii, 24;) nor are they infrequent at the present day in Palestine, notwithstanding the absence of the forests in which they anciently lurked.

8. *The number of first-born males (22,273) among the Israelites (Num. iii, 43) is entirely too small for a total population of two millions.* We answer:

(1.) The text containing this isolated statement may have become corrupt, as numbers in the Hebrew copy frequently have, in consequence of their having been originally written by means of letters for figures, which were easily mistaken.

(2.) There may have been some peculiar method of computing or registering these first-borns so as not to exhibit the usual proportion of the population at large. What this peculiarity probably was we shall endeavor to show in the sequel.

9. *The seventy persons of Jacob's family could not have increased in the course of four generations, or 215 years, to two millions of souls.* We reply:

(1.) There is really no impossibility in the case even thus stated, as several instances are on record of an equal rate of increase, especially the noted case of the mutineers of the ship *Bounty*, who settled on Pitcairn's Island, and intermarried with the natives. But there are several circumstances that should lead us to expect an extraordinary increase in the

present case. (a) A special blessing was promised the Hebrews in this respect, (Gen. xii, 2; xxv, 23; xxviii, 14, etc.,) which the history informs us was remarkably fulfilled during the interval under consideration, (Gen. xlvii, 27; Exod. i, 7.) (b) The fecundity of women in Egypt was proverbial, (as the author allows,)* and the Hebrewesses excelled even the Egyptian mothers in this regard, (Exod. i, 19.) (c) Although in general the Exodus was in the fourth generation from the migration to Egypt,† yet in many families there had been a larger number of generations;‡ and it is certain from numerous indications that these successive generations *continued to live simultaneously, and were prolific to an unusual old age.* (d) Early marriages have always been the custom in the East, and among the Hebrews in particular a numerous offspring was universally favored. (e) Polygamy was undoubtedly practiced to a considerable extent among them, and Egyptian females were at hand (especially those of the lower caste) to serve as concubines or secondary wives to the Israelitish heads of families.

(2.) It is altogether probable that the two millions in question were not exclusively of Hebrew extraction, that is, not strictly the lineal descendants of the seventy individuals composing Jacob's immediate family who migrated to Egypt. It is nowhere expressly stated that they were so: Colenso, indeed, thus interprets the sacred narrative; but we are not bound to look at it through his unfortunate eyes. The accuracy of the six hundred thousand able bodied men who marched out of Egypt, (evidently a proleptical round number taken from the later enumeration,) upon which the estimate of the entire host is based, is vouched for by the exact sum, (603,550,) yielded by the census soon afterward held; and this again is confirmed by the detailed numbers as given under each tribe. This latter mode of registry also proves that all included in it were in some sense accounted as belonging to one or another of the

* Producing in some cases four and even five at a birth. (Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* viii, 6, 1.)

† In substantiating this fact, Colenso has corroborated Gen. xv, 16.

‡ Joshua, however, was not the *tenth* in descent from Ephraim, as apparently stated in 1 Chron. vii, 22-27; for the lineage recommences with Ladan, who was probably another son of Ephraim. (Browne, *Ordo Sacerdotum*, p. 306.)

tribal divisions of the people : but it does not necessarily follow that they were all absolutely full blooded or original Israelites ; they may in very many instances have been *adopted* members of the Hebrew community, either as proselytes, domestics, relatives, or sympathizers, whose attachment was so strong as to induce them to link their fortunes to that of the fugitives. Nay, the supposition is not all unreasonable that the mass of the Egyptian population of Goshen had become so intertwined in interest, affection, and association with the Israelitish settlers in their midst, during the lapse of more than two centuries of remarkable prosperity and harmonious intercourse, as gradually to have melted in a great measure into one community with them, for it must be borne in mind that the restrictive enactments which created and maintained the invidious distinction of Jew and Gentile did not then exist ; and as the Egyptians themselves, according to several ancient authorities, likewise practiced circumcision universally, there was no outward barrier to such an amalgamation. Joseph himself had set the example of intermarriage with the native Egyptians ; and the favor of the reigning dynasty, combined with the manifest thrift of the new comers, must have made affinities very popular between the Hebrew and Egyptian families. These accretions, together with the offspring of the home-born servants and tried attendants, many of whom (according to patriarchal usage) would of course accompany or follow the family of Jacob into Egypt, (particularly as the then prevailing famine would leave them no other alternative for subsistence,) while others would be acquired there in still larger numbers ; all these additions may readily be deemed to have swelled the Israelitish population in this favored residence to an unwonted growth. We call attention to a few intimations in the scriptural narrative itself, that go to warrant this explanation. (a) It is expressly stated (Exod. xii, 38) that, when the Israelites took up their march out of Egypt, “ a *mixed multitude* [מִזְגָּג, *promiscuous crowd*, that is, of camp followers, Gesenius] went up with them,” evidently composed of their Egyptian friends and adherents. True, these are distinguished from the “ six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children ;” but they nevertheless indicate how strong and intimate an attachment had grown up between the Hebrews and their Egyptian neighbors, (a fact also

attested by the readiness of the latter in granting the request* of valuable presents, and attributable especially to the influence which the recent miracles of Moses had secured,) and they give rise to the suspicion that they were themselves mostly the families of a considerable proportion of these very six hundred thousand footmen, in which case we must make a corresponding deduction from the estimated number of proper Israelitish households. The continued presence of these miscellaneous companions will go far toward accounting for the frequent disorders and mutinies that distinguish the subsequent history of the travels through the desert. (b) A distinction of this kind between true-born and naturalized Hebrews is revealed by the discrepancy above noticed in the census of the first-born, as compared with the total male population. These semi-Jews, although admitted (as was Hobab) to all the privileges of citizens in the newly formed migratory colony, (as befitted their former internal relations, and especially their present alliance,) and classified along with the clans into which they had become affiliated, or with which they chose to fraternize as portions of the general tribal *corps d'armée*, were nevertheless of necessity segregated by the strict canvass of primogeniture, in which, as so much hereditary privilege of a personal, social, national, and religious character depended upon it, not even the sons of concubine wives, much less other more loosely formed connections, could be allowed to enter, although for general purposes, whether political or ecclesiastical, the distinction was not observed. We are persuaded, therefore, that the census of the first-born, as given in Num. iii, 43, that is, twenty-two thousand two hundred and seventy-three, is the true index of the pure Hebrew population at the time.

This discovery of the large proportion of merely nominal Israelites among the huge migrating host in fact solves fundamentally and at once most of the difficulties advanced by Colenso; for it will be perceived that they are nearly all based upon the theory of *numbers* which he applies to each question. Thus, when the number of strictly Israelitish households is so greatly reduced, we have no occasion for the hundred thousand lambs for Paschal meals, and consequently are not obliged to

* Not *loan*, for the original term is *שָׁאַל*, to ask, improperly rendered "borrowed" and "lent" in Exod. i, 35, 36.

provide sustenance for the innumerable flocks and herds imagined to have existed in the train of the migration. The details of the march itself are also prodigiously facilitated as to the preparation and accommodation of the families; for a comparatively small caravan of genuine Hebrews may then be conceived as starting under conduct of Moses and Aaron, which is joined on its way by motley assemblages of the Hebræo-Egyptian population, bringing with them the remainder of the personal effects of the refugees. It was apparently this unexpected magnitude of the Exodus that induced in the king and his cabinet such vehement regret at having consented to their departure.

Our limits allow us to notice but in the briefest manner the author's remaining objections. He regards the rate of increase among the adult males of Dan (not quite three per cent.) and the total males of Levi (not quite five per cent.) during the thirty-eight years in the wilderness (Num. i-iii, and xxvi) as so exceedingly small, especially in comparison with that among the other tribes, (for example, Manasseh, which increased over sixty per cent.,) as to render it "sufficiently plain that the account of these numbers is of no historical value whatever." Had he cited the remaining tribes, however, they would not have been so apposite for his purpose, since we should have seen that none of the rest increased very largely, while several actually diminished, as indeed did the sum total. Why Manasseh alone experienced so large a growth, we, of course, cannot now tell;* but we know that similar variations at present occur in adjoining towns and counties.

The author once more objects to the duties of the priests as being excessively arduous, in fact, intolerable, especially at the passover in the wilderness, seeing that there were but Aaron and his four (eventually two) sons to offer all these sacrifices! What, pray, were all the other "sons of Levi" about, that they could not aid their sacerdotal brethren? Or is it to be imagined that, upon special emergencies, Moses had no liberty to

* It is obvious that the circumstances of the sojourn in the desert were not favorable to an increase of population. The only real difficulty (though incorrectly stated by Colenso) is this large increment of Manasseh. The only explanation we can suggest, is a possible transfer of some of the floating population of Egyptian extraction to this tribe of the stock of Joseph.

appoint deputies for such offices? Moreover, much of the Levitical code was intended to be fully executed only after the arrival in Canaan, and parts of it were even not instituted till a comparatively late period of the sojourn in the desert. As to the passover in question, if our view of the composition of the Israelitish host is correct, very many families may not have observed that festival at all; indeed, we have positive evidence that great neglect of these ceremonial ordinances, even the most essential, prevailed during the migration through the wilderness. (Josh. v, 7; Amos v, 25.)

Finally, the author *calculates* that the six months between Aaron's death (Num. xxiii, 38) and the farewell of Moses (Deut. i, 3) would have been fully occupied with the mourning for Aaron, the battle with Arad, the incidents of the fiery serpents, the nine encampments adjoining, the conquest of Sihon, the capture of Jaazer, and the reduction of Bashan, (Num. xx, xxi;) leaving no space for the march to the plains of Moab, the narrative of Balaam, the idolatry with the Moabitish females, and the consequent pestilence, the second census, and the war with Midian, (Num. xxii-xxvi,) all which took place before the demise of Moses. Had he set his wits as actively to work to ascertain *how* all this might have transpired, as he has to make out that it could *not* have taken place at all, he might have bethought him that many of these transactions, especially the campaigns, were probably going on at the same time in detachments of troops from the main body stationary at Shittim, where Moses was personally engaged in the concluding scenes of his career.

Bishop Colenso feels greatly shocked (page 210) by the inhuman manner in which the Israelites are said to have treated their Midianite captives, (Num. xxxi;) and he is, if possible, still more scandalized (page 50) at the countenance given by the Mosaic statutes to the system of slavery, (Exod. xxi, 4, 20, 21.) As to the first of these points, we agree with him that war is a dreadful thing under any circumstances, and we in this country are at present well able to appreciate its horrors. But slaughter has in all ages been its inevitable accompaniment, and its rigors have always fallen not only upon the soldiers themselves, but also upon their homes and families, that have thereby been desolated. Yet we are not aware that the

numbers stated in any historical work to have been killed in battle, nor even the atrocities related to have been committed upon prisoners, has ever been made a serious ground of impeaching the "historical character" of the narrative. Such scenes of blood, alas! have been too common on our earth to appear improbable occurrences. The massacre of these Midianites, however, was not only part of Jehovah's general charge to Israel utterly to slay and extirpate the idolatrous aborigines, but it was a special act of retribution for their intrigues in the matter of Baal-peor, and the Midianitish women were justly made to bear the heaviest part of the penalty for their prominent and shameless agency in that infamous transaction. War is stern, but the judgments of the Almighty are even more severe upon the godless! The humanitarian notions of Dr. Colenso may lead him to impeach this act of sovereign justice, even as it induces him to reject the doctrine of the perdition of the wicked, however plainly inculcated in holy writ; but his unbelief cannot make void the righteousness of God. A denial of the punishment of the wicked, whether in this world or the next, will not lessen its certainty in the least, any more than to shut our eyes against the awful scenes of the earthquake, the conflagration, the flood, or the pestilence, will stay their ravages. The bishop has here entered into a controversy, not with man, but with his own Almighty Master, whose ways he thus virtually impugns.

As to the critic's second moral objection, the bearing of the Mosaic law upon human slavery, he is altogether mistaken in his position. The design and the actual effect of those enactments was, not to confirm, much less institute, but to ameliorate, and eventually abolish the usage. For proof of this, if any be needed, we refer our readers to the able discussion of the whole subject of Hebrew slavery, both in its biblical and Rabbinical aspects, by the learned Jew, Dr. M. Mielziner, ("Die Verhältnisse der Sklaven bei den alten Hebräern," Copenhagen, 1859,) which has been translated in the (Gettysburg) *Evangelical Review* for January, 1862. We may add, that we of America could wish that Bishop Colenso's prelat-ical brethren might so far, at least, share in his "revulsion of feeling" against human chattelship as to cease their aiding and abetting, by every means that they dare to employ, the

cause of a rebellious confederacy whose avowed corner-stone is the "divine right" of slavery!*

His incidental cavils at the universality of the flood, (page 5,) and the account of the arrest of the sun and moon by Joshua, (page 8,) we pass by as having already been amply discussed in treatises expressly prepared on these subjects by competent writers innumerable.

We have thus followed "his lordship" through the driest details of his portentous "critical examination," and found

* We quote part of the language of the *British Quarterly Review* on this point:

"The small space we have left must be assigned to a notice of the difficulty which arose between Dr. Colenso and his native Zulu, and by which the heathen convert appears to have done so much toward converting his instructor. Here it is:

"'If the master [of a Hebrew servant] have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, the wife and her children shall be her master's, and he shall go out free by himself.' (Exod. xxi, 4.)

"The wife and children in such a case being placed under the protection of such words as these:

"'If a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money.' (Exod. xxi, 20, 21.)

"'I shall never forget the revulsion of feeling with which a very intelligent Christian native, with whose help I was translating these words into the Zulu tongue, first heard them as words said to be uttered by the same great and gracious Being whom I was teaching him to trust in and adore. His whole soul revolted against the notion, that the great and blessed God, the merciful Father of all mankind, would speak of a servant or maid as mere money, and allow a horrible crime to go unpunished, because the victim of the brutal usage had survived a few hours. My own heart and conscience at the time fully sympathized with his.'

"The bishop, however, met the perplexity of the inquirer for the present by suggesting that this thought about the money-value of the bondsman came to the mind of Moses at the time, and that, supposing it to have been divinely given to him, he recorded it. But surely something better than this might have been said upon the case. We English Christians in the middle of the nineteenth century judge it sinful for any man to hold another in bondage. [And yet many of them can lend all their moral influence toward crushing a nation that is struggling to shake off this evil inherited from England!] But is it sufficiently considered how long it has taken to bring men into this way of thinking? Nearly fifteen centuries intervened between the Exodus and the Advent. But in the course of that world-education of which we have spoken, the Augustan age came, and no nation, no community, great or small, had learned to account slaveholding a sin. While Cicero, one of Dr. Colenso's great lights, was pleading at the Roman bar, it was one of the great maxims of Roman law that a slave is *non persona sed res*, not a person but a thing, a commodity; in Dr. Colenso's phrase, "mere money." Even the New Testament does not contain a passage teaching in any direct form that society should know nothing of bondsmen. It lays down great principles, which were to issue in the extinction of such service, and in the extinction of many things like it. But this extinction was left to follow from the slow action of those principles. St. Paul knew that every bondsman in the Roman empire was simply so much money, according to the opinion, feeling, and law of the times; and that if a servant of this order should be injured even to death, there was no law to punish the wrong-doer. Still, that the preachers of the Gospel might not be presented to the mind of that generation as the preachers of a servile war, and the purpose of their special mission be frustrated, slavery, with all its wrongs and barbarities, passes without any direct proscription."—P. 186.

that it evinces everywhere the fault-finding pedagogue, rather than the devout investigator.* Niebuhr, who first applied the incredulous philosophy to the confessed "legends of Livy," doubtless had no idea that his disciples of the "mythical" school would carry it out into the petty process of dissecting statistics. There is no historian, however honest, that is secure from conviction, if put to the rack after this *ex-parte* fashion. Bishop Colenso has succeeded in striking from beneath his own feet the earliest historical basis of revealed religion, and appears to rejoice in having thrown off the "superstitious" faith in which he was reared to his present eminence. Yet he offers us no substitute for the precious records thus degraded below the authority of profane history. He seems unable to "define his own position." We wonder not at this, for it is a most anomalous and unsteady one. We advise all who may feel bewildered by the perusal of these audacious sophisms, so lately conceived by the author himself, and so eagerly promulged, to wait until they shall see the end of his belief; and to his ecclesiastical superiors we recommend, in their future selection of bishops, to heed the apostle's caution, 1 Tim. iii, 6.

ART. VII.—FUNERAL ORATION UPON STEPHEN CURCELLÆUS.

DELIVERED BY ARNOLD POLENBURG.

[PART SECOND.]

CURCELLÆUS IN BELGIUM—DYING TESTIMONY OF HIS WIFE.

CURCELLÆUS, as I have said, took refuge in this our Belgium, as an asylum of truth, an altar of freedom, and an abode of peace; the only refuge for oppressed consciences. Here he hoped to live and die. But before we depart with him from

* It ought to be borne in mind that the narrative of the Exodus purports to be the record of no ordinary scene; but is constantly spoken of in Scripture as a series of events bordering on the miraculous in all their particulars, having been achieved by the "high and mighty hand" of Jehovah. The candid reader is accordingly prepared to find many things in the history not only extraordinary, but unaccountable on the grounds of human calculation.

France, let us not in this place omit mention of his wife, Joanna de Beaulieu le Blanc, whom a certain person, now an enemy of Curcellæus, calls "a noble and remarkable woman;" who, when from disease she had been for almost a year near death's portal, drew up in the city of Vitriacum a tablet or testamentary letter, which she sent to her brothers, Stephen and Louis de Beaulieu le Blanc, the former pastor of Sylvanectum, the latter of Plesis, and to James and Peter de Beaulieu le Blanc, the former of whom was the secretary of Charles, King of England, the latter was an eminent advocate in the Parliament at Paris. To all of these, whose love toward her husband she deemed too little, she sent this token of her will, in which she bequeathed not estates, nor furnitures, nor funds, but that which she held far more precious than gold or silver, *love, concord, and peace*, to be fraternally cherished toward her husband, and never to be interrupted by differences of opinion in regard to religious matters. I will here passingly insert a few extracts from the terms of her will, not only because of the weightiness of the sentiments and of their worthiness of perpetuation, but also because of the prudence and piety of that noble matron:

The Testament which I leave to my honored and loved brothers and to my most excellent sister:

SIR, AND MOST HONORED BROTHER,—I send this my letter to you in order to make known what position our affairs have assumed. My affliction is not slight on account of my lingering disease and prostration of strength. Our little ones, thanks to God, are still very well. My only trouble is because my husband, Curcellæus, is often plunged into the deepest grief as he sees me rapidly approaching the end of life. He clings to me with as great love as from the beginning, and for ten long years has shown me as much honor and kindness as any wife could ask or desire from her husband. He kindly and consolingly soothes all my griefs. I believe that in this thing God takes cares of his own. I am often overwhelmed with sorrow when I contemplate the great distance which separates me from you; but Heaven has not left me desolate, who raises and comforts me through the husband whom he has given me. I entreat and beseech you all, in the name of God, that in whatever degree we have lived together in harmony and peace, to the same extent you may be willing to esteem my husband; this is the sum of his prayers, and he loves me and regards you as his own brothers. But I fear lest the difficulty which has arisen between him and his colleagues may produce some estrangement in your feelings on account of the suspicions which some have conceived toward him,

as if he cherished any concealed sentiments in his bosom. I earnestly attest to you that my husband cherishes no opinions except those which any pious and approved Christian might fully entertain. No doctrine ever was adopted or held by him except that alone which Christ gave to his disciples as sufficient for enabling them to convince and instruct mankind unto salvation. I therefore pray and entreat you, by the honor of God and the love I have ever shown toward you, that you regard Curcellæus not as a stranger or a foreigner, but as a most loved brother and an heir of the same promise of eternal life. We by no means ought to adopt an evil opinion of him because on some points of little importance he differs in opinion from us. "Ye shall know them by their fruits," says the Saviour; "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." According to the measure of the reason and knowledge which God has been pleased to bestow upon me, I have recognized in my husband no conduct which was not according to holiness. Recently a few individuals have arisen against him, and persuaded themselves that he is destitute of all reason; but they ought to attribute this to his modesty, because he imagines that the ears of many are shut to his reasonings. But I earnestly entreat you and my other brothers to heed the admonition of the apostle, who teaches us not to judge or decide prematurely; but that, proving all things, we should retain that which is good. O that by you all, as well as by me, the disposition of my husband might be clearly understood. Well do I know that you would eagerly seek his acquaintance and friendly conversation. As far as I am able, I commend him, together with my children, to you. I ask you that you may beseech in my name, my most honored friends and relations, that the love of which they have esteemed me worthy they may transfer and bestow upon my husband and my children; and I would also have you declare that it is my constant prayer, that as I have cultivated peace and friendship while God has granted me the possession of this life, so even after my death these may live and flourish among them.

To you all I bid a final adieu: to my most excellent sisters, your wives, to your children; in short, to all my dearly beloved friends. I ask you, my brother, to kindly send a copy of this writing to all my brothers, and preserve this original, written by my own hand for yourself. For I desire that you and they also may order the execution of this small will. You can do this readily upon the first opportunity; for you will perceive that this is drawn up in the style in which wills usually are. I fear you will not receive this letter before my departure from earth. Not with an uninterrupted pen was it dictated by me; but opportunities and intervals were snatched from the debility of my brain occasioned by the paroxysms of fever. You will, therefore, hold it in greater esteem. You will kindly pardon me if this is rude and unpolished; for as it is the work of my own impulse, so is it also my own composition. If I had desired to use the assistance of Curcellæus it would have been presented to you in a more polished style. But that I may put

a conclusion to this document, I am and shall be till the end of life yours, and to you all a most perfectly devoted and faithful sister. Done in Helmauru, February 21, 1625.

JOANNA LE BLANC.

CURCELLÆUS AND EPISCOPIUS—SLANDERS OF MARESIUS.

We have followed in our oration Curcellæus's departure from France into Belgium, and it is now worth our while to know in what manner he conducted himself in these lands, how he supported himself, with what talents he was endowed, what books he wrote, what friendships he cultivated, how powerful was his influence among his superiors in dignity and authority, and, in short, in what way he was led from this sorrowful life unto death, and from death to the heavenly ascension. A certain person* became his enemy because upon his arrival in these lands "*he prostrated himself at the feet of Episcopus.*" Next, he criticised him at great length because he had subscribed to the Canons of Dort; and, finally, he reproached him for working for printers in the correction of books for the press, and by this mechanical labor supporting himself and family. In ignorance, O Maresius, do you reprehend the doings of your foe, or rather your friend, (for it was by your will and not by his that variance occurred,) for what you say is entirely untrue; and the real truth is no disgrace but an honor to your friend. I deny that he acted as a suppliant. Upon his entrance into this audience-room, Episcopus, out of honor, arose and wished to hand over the professor's chair to him, that he might preside over the debate then to be held. Proof this is of the honor in which he was held by the honored Episcopus, and how unnecessary it was to "prostrate himself" as a suppliant before this most accomplished man. But our friend served at the printing-press and was reduced to narrow circumstances! He did this, not induced by any hope of gain, but according to a desire of some of his most noted friends; and by the request of certain of these, especially of the illustrious Hugo Grotius, whose notes upon an edition of the Gospels he cleared of mistakes. He also translated some mathematical works into other languages, which I do not believe his enemy could have done better; and, according to the desire of his friends, wished to do this if he were able. Some geographical delineations which

* Maresius. See p. 326.

Cl. Caspar Barlæus had prepared in his great Blævian work, he adorned and completed. But I confess, (for why should I deny that which is true and right,) I confess that this reverend man was at first coldly received by some on account of that first signing of the canons. I confess that he was involved in embarrassments. But he well foresaw these difficult positions; he willingly cast himself into them, he encountered them with a brave spirit, he nobly gave himself to be tested by these hardships, and he forced all to acknowledge that nothing was done by him falsely or hypocritically, and proved himself to be fully prepared to encounter every difficulty, that he might preserve an undisturbed and inviolate peace of conscience. Was it not then imprudent, shall I not say senseless, in this critic to reprehend what was worthy of praise, and to depress as an enemy the man whom he should extol as a friend? Is not he a firm believer in God who would permit his worldly circumstances to become reduced to the utmost that he might bring his conscience, fettered by the narrow limits and restrictions of Dort, into the just liberty of the sons of God? But who drove him into these difficulties but the slaves of the despotism of Dort? In which if any sin is committed it is not his who bore the suffering, but his who inflicted. He is deservedly adjudged to have inflicted the suffering who approves its infliction, who is prepared to inflict, and who acknowledges for brethren the authors of the infliction.

In illustration I adduce an incident at the time occurring. When the debate which I have mentioned above was held before Episcopius as theological professor, in the presence of Curcellæus, a disquisition was read concerning the sense and fulfillment of our Lord's promise found in the nineteenth chapter of Matthew, that *whoever has left home, and brothers, and sisters, etc., on account of my name, shall receive a hundredfold and shall obtain the heirship of eternal life*. Episcopius answered that this promise was frequently unfulfilled in this life; but its fulfillment might be confidently expected in the life to come. Nevertheless, God, in the course of our present life, does none the less confer this reward upon *some* with a most eminent liberality, so that they can acquiesce in their own lot; he also sometimes demonstrates the truthfulness of his promise by the full performance itself, as if for the purpose of a decisive example.

for the confirmation of others, lest they should be plunged into utter discouragement. At the same time, in an exulting temper, he said, "Take, for instance, this our Curcellæus and myself, in whom you may recognize the express signs of the fulfilled promise. I, as an exile from Holland, voluntarily took refuge in France; he, as an exile from France, took refuge in Holland. Homes, brothers, and sisters, we abandoned; but our God has not deserted us, but abundantly cares for us, for our fortunes, and our friends whom we hold dearer than earthly possessions."

CURCELLÆUS AS THEOLOGICAL PROFESSOR AT AMSTERDAM.

Not a very long time did our deceased friend remain in these embarrassments, since he has ever been honored by our adherence; and after Episcopi^{us} departed from this earthly habitation to the better world, by the unanimous vote of our community Curcellæus was raised into the position of the deceased; together with those noted men, Charles Niellius, who now lives with God among the glorified, and Bartholomew Prævestius, who is now a survivor and here present, and has entered his seventy-first year, having long since obtained an honorable withdrawal from labors. In addition to these at length was Albert Hutten, formerly Professor of Sacred Literature at Sedan, who thence departed to take charge of his native Church at Nevinagus. After he had been raised to this position he alone, and with his venerable colleagues, clung to his work with diligence and the greatest assiduity, so that neither indeed at home nor abroad, in his auditory nor out of it, did he wish us to be destitute of his counsel or his aid. For I remember that when I came into this state for the sake of my studies that he, reclining in his bed, not without great danger, carried on our uninterrupted discussions at his own house. But he carried the studious youths, as was agreed upon among us, in no one separate part of learning; but for a long time, like an Atlas, he carried us through all the languages which conduced to an acquirement of the sciences, through all the sciences which prepare the mind for theology, and finally he sustained upon his own shoulders the very arduous task of theology. He alone presided at the declamations which were held each week; he alone taught Greek literature as far as was allowable. He taught us the discipline of manners, the knowledge of natural

philosophy, the science of things human and divine. He promoted us at first to the study of mathematics, and prepared for us a certain clear method of learning astronomy, and a little while after embraced it, so far as conduced to theological purposes, in a small compendium. And finally he seated himself like a leader and a prince, or like a most noted artisan, in building and adorning this citadel of theology as his own appropriate work. He delivered many lectures, dictated many treatises, and trained the students as if in a palestra or laboratory furnished with all the proper apparatus, not only by discussion, but also by instituting examinations. But why pursue the details? He was for some time like a sole dictator among us. At first he dictated to his scholars a small commentary upon the Catholic Epistle of Jude, which, nevertheless, he did not complete. He taught us theology by leading topics, and this he ever applied to the practice of morals, of which he completed nearly the whole treatment. Besides, he dispensed a certain new course of discussions after almost the same train of topics as he had followed in his lectures, except that many things which were omitted in his lectures he here accumulated as a mass, and all of them were written with such a strength of argument and beauty of order, and with such a perspicuity of style, that I hesitate not to say that no one could have composed anything of this kind more accurately or elegantly; and so, although these things could not be brought to a finish on account of his disease and death, nevertheless they are most worthy of the earliest publication possible.

HIS THEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

He published not a few works which he has left as a clear testimony of his learning, humanity, and moderation. During the controversy on predestination, when a new discussion arose between Moses Amyrædus and Peter Molinæus, he, like a Palæmon, interposed as an arbiter by the publication of a French work which he titled, "*Advis d'un personnage disintéressé*," etc. In this small work he declares what he approves and disapproves on either side. He decided that Amyrædus spoke rightly but thought wrongly when he declared that although God wished all to be saved, and Christ suffered death for all, without exception, yet that the number of men abso-

lutely elected or absolutely rejected was limited by God. But that Molinaeus, neither in word nor sense, agreed with Scripture, since he denied what Scripture affirms, that God wished all mankind to be saved, and declares that reprobates are not called to a participation of salvation; whom nevertheless God, by his ministers, invited to the marriage feast. (Matt. xxii.)

He published another book against the professor of theology at Saumur, in which he defends the opinions held by Arminius and himself concerning the right of God over his creatures; opposing especially the error of those who believe that God is able to torment by hellish and eternal woes the innocent little souls of helpless infants; and some, with Calvin, even contend that he really torments the infants of the Gentiles, although they deny that they are innocent, and shamefully take refuge under the imputation of original sin. Besides, he published in the next year the New Testament, corrected from the most ancient manuscripts, and illustrated by a very great variety of readings, and most accurately printed in a most beautiful type. At the latest moments of his life he published a learned work upon *The Eating of Blood*, in which, with many other reasons being adduced, he strove to prove that both hereafter and now, according to the command of God delivered to Noah, and the prescription of the apostles, which they sent abroad and promulgated to all the Churches of the Gentiles, that all Christians should abstain from the eating of blood.

A few years afterward he undertook the defense of David Blondell against the criminations of Maresius, shamefully heaped upon a deceased friend; which defense he prefixed as a preface to a dissertation of D. Blondell, in which preface he demonstrates that the vulgar history of a Popess Joan ought to be rejected as fabulous. Finally, the defense of this defense is in press, and about to see the light for which it aspires, a book most complete in every kind of learning, wherein he gives his opinion explained and confirmed: *Concerning the words Person and Trinity, etc. Concerning Original Sin. Concerning the Necessity of a Knowledge of Christ. Concerning the Justification of Man before God*, and other sublime subjects of Christian faith. In this treatise may be seen the injustice of the contempt expressed by the man who, once his friend now his enemy, even attempted to make it a matter of reproach that

Curcellæus had from age become blind both in body and in mind. Such a man would have reproached the patriarch Isaac for the failure of his eyes, and would have ridiculed the baldness of the prophet Elisha with the boys of Bethel. But let him beware lest the destroyers be upon him, as happened to the boys insulting the holy old man. Sophocles, the celebrated poet among the Greeks, when his sons sought to exclude him from the family property because on account of his old age he seemed to have lost his intellect, having produced and read his recently composed tragedy of Electra, so overcame and confounded his sons that they could not utter a single word against him. So this book, composed in Curcellæus's last moments, abundantly proves his power of mind. Even if he were from old age blind, for what reason should he be so earnestly despised and insulted. I am no more ashamed of my blind master than was Jerome, who has left it recorded in his *Chronicles* that his teacher, Didymus Alexandrinus, was blind from the fifth year of his birth.

I do not forget that a certain doctor of the Reformed, especially celebrated among our adversaries, when he was asked by Curcellæus whether he thought so unfriendly a man, belching forth so atrociously so many harsh and malignant rebukes, ought to be answered, said, "Let the coarse beast alone." I know that this was the judgment of other noted men; nor is it wonderful, since no other kind of vindication is more worthy a grave and Christian man, nor can the darts of calumny be in any other way better blunted or broken, than by slighting their loquacity by a firm, deep silence. For what end will there be of quarrels if we wrangle with wranglers, and if we respond endlessly to barkers? Yet because men are elate over others, from others silence proclaim their victory and are appeased by the empty pretense of a triumph, our sage judged it would be for his interest and for his fame after death, and for the advancement of divine truth, that such atrocious charges should not fall unpunished and without castigation from the mouths of men. And just as nature in many things exerts her utmost strength for a final attempt when she finds herself failing, and as the sun when it is nearest its setting pours forth more rays than usual upon the earth and casts into our eyes more light than we need, so this venerable man as he labored in his last

moments, and by his labor added strength to his somewhat failing system, and collected all the energies and industry of his mind, and so conquered himself; and as he approached the light above, so did he emit from himself the more glorious rays. I here omit many learned prefaces which he prefixed to the published writings of other learned men, among which, very eminent in value, is that prefatory character of *Episcopius* which will be found inserted as an Introduction to his *Theological Institutes*. I omit also his letters of many and different kinds of argument which have not yet been published. Among these the one written to the illustrious *Hugo Grotius* concerning *Antichrist*; the one to *Sorberius* concerning the abuses or errors of the *Romish Church*; and that to *Adrian Pæsius*, most skilled in theology among jurists, concerning *Popish idolatry* as being enormous, and therefore worthy of condemnation, are the most excellent.

THE PRIMARY AIM OF REMONSTRANTISM — CHRISTIAN
TOLERATION.

It may be desirable to note the object this illustrious man had in view, in all his words, writings, and deeds. For we cannot believe that so many and great undertakings could be made by so wise a man, unless he had some well-defined object in view. This will be clearly seen from the very first by those candidly examining his works. He first of all directed his mind to a search after divine TRUTH; for he thought that this treasure, descending from heaven, should be preferred to all other acquirements. Next, he had all the thoughts of his mind directed to INTEGRITY; because he believed that not even truth could be of benefit to us, unless it brought some strikingly advantageous aid to our piety. Finally, this especially he wished, and for this peculiarly he labored, to unite the Christian body, torn into many and terrible schisms; to compose and conciliate the separate, distracted feelings of various minds; and to teach that not all the doctrines which were alleged as a pretext for causing or cherishing a schism were vital for salvation, and at the same time to show that those things which had not the weight of necessity by no means sufficed for dividing the Church of Christ. To this all things were to be referred which he meditated, uttered, or performed; for this he refused to sub-

scribe to the famous canons of the synod, because we, whose opinions ought not to be, were condemned; for this he abandoned his loved country, France, and endured many hardships for the sake of mutual toleration; and for this he determined to contest, as if for some divine palladium. He conceded to others as much as he thought should be equally granted to him; demanded that nothing should be conceded to himself from others, except what justice and right reason and the sacred writings require should be admitted. What is more holy than this proposition, what more salutary, what more necessary for the times? For many contend concerning the truth, and so contend, that they never obtain truth but lose charity. Hence the many disputes in Christendom on slight causes. But what is more disgraceful to us as members of Christ, what more ignominious to Christ as our Head and Leader, than that his seamless coat, and his body, which ought to be united by the closest ties of love, should be torn into a thousand fragments? *This indeed is the distinction of Remonstrantism; this our crown of glory, because we neither caused this schism, nor consented to any other, nor cherished nor approved any;* but we invite and exhort all who love Christ and adhere to his Gospel alone to enter this communion of peace. For who is so blind or so unwise that he does not desire this method of inaugurating peace should be embraced in every possible way? Who does not think that this school of TOLERANCE is to be studiously attended as a training-place of charity, and so of all the virtues? For where there is Christian charity there is a bond of all the virtues. Who would not regard such a man, who subordinated all other things to this divine cause and discipline, and for this was pre-eminent, worthy after death to be gratefully esteemed and commemorated?

HOW HE BECAME A TOLERATIONIST.

But whereas this reverend man descended from such an ancestry at Geneva, was educated at the Genevese Stoa, and was taught by such masters that he would seem by his very nativity to be trained and imbued by no desire of mutual toleration, but for applying force and persecution to dissenters, this may be a matter of inquiry with us, how he, so enslaved, could aspire to a hope of liberty, and be animated by so unexpected

a preference for toleration and peace? In the first place, it must be acknowledged, and never in any way dissembled, that God, the Father of lights, does not deign to bestow the same gifts and endowments upon all, but grants a greater measure to some, a less to others. For although to every one he gives such an amount as suffices in proportion to the strength, yet he bestows talents with a great inequality of shares. But that mildness of character which oftentimes suggests moderate counsels, although it might sometimes seem innate, should be regarded as a gift from God. As those who for a long time have been in war and among warriors, stained with the blood of the enemy, most earnestly desire peace, because they are especially averse to slaughter and blood, so some, while they are associated with persecutors, and contemplate the pyres erected to the destruction of erring souls, are moved with pity, and with a sense of our common frailty, and shrink from the harsh fierceness of those persecutors. To this may be also added great power of domestic influences and instruction, especially if there happen to one not an unsuitable but an approved and prudent instructor, endowed with that authority that we feel the rightfulness of obedience to his admonitions. All these great advantages, by the divine benignity, fell to the lot of our Curcellæus.

It is now proper to make mention of other circumstances, showing the genius of the man which the grace of God bestowed upon him, and which were of influence in forming within him a mild spirit.

A TOLERATIONIST EVEN AT GENEVA. CHARLES PERROTTE.

I have not yet mentioned what ought not to be omitted in this place; that soon after his birth he lost his father, and was immediately delivered over for training and education to his nearest kinsman, Charles Perrottus, pastor of the Church at Geneva, and then the theological professor. We owe much to this Perrottus for the zeal which he manifested in the cause of religious liberty. For after having scattered the densest shades of popish superstition, when the ardent love of persecution animated all, he attempted to restrain their ardor, and existed in his day as indeed a counselor of mutual toleration. It was from his teaching that the learned and scholarly Utenbørgardus emerged as a herald of peace; for when he was about to

return from Geneva into Holland, Perrottus earnestly counseled him, immediately upon his entrance into the sacred ministry, to abstain from all bitterness of counsels either in defending or spreading religion; not to condemn others for a slight difference of opinion, but using all lenity, to exert all his powers for the unity of Christendom, which it was a great cause for sorrow should be so sadly rent. He also added that some in the Reformed Church had gone further than was justifiable, who presented and urged their opinions with too great zeal; in the enumeration of which he did not hesitate to mention some of his own colleagues who then were filling the first positions at Geneva. And lest his counsel should be forgotten by Utenbogaardus, in the latter's album he wrote his name, and under it that divine saying of Christ, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." To Thomas Tilius, who, at first abbot of St. Bernard, abandoned the Papacy, and was installed pastor of the Church at Delphi, he addressed similar language: "Many of the Reformed Church imitate the example of Uzzah, by rashly placing their hand, in a manner threatening ruin, upon the ark of God." Would that his testimony, "Concerning the Avoidance of Extreme Opinions in Matters of Religion," which no doubt would be very effective in the preservation of peace, was now in existence! Mention was made of it in some catalogues of the Synod of Orleans, in the following language: "'Concerning the Avoidance of Extreme Opinions in Matters of Religion;' a book of Charles Perrottus, not yet, to my knowledge, published." It never was published, but, according to report, was suppressed by the Genevans on account of its opposition to their doctrines condemnatory of moderation.

A great part of the happiness of Curcellæus certainly it was, that in earliest boyhood he was inducted into the family and patronage of this learned and pious man. When Curcellæus venerated Calvin, and preferred Beza to all others, Perrottus, on the other hand, in the presence of not a few learned men, in a very powerful oration, inveighed against the dogmas of those doctors, especially when they condemned or attempted to oppress dissenters. Our Curcellæus at first wondered at the speech of this learned man, because thus far he had regarded a dissent from the opinions of these masters as a sort of inexpiable

crime. Yet because he gave great weight to the venerable wisdom of this man, and because the learned men sitting around did not oppose him, and because the mild discourse by its own beauty commended itself to a temper not very severe, he determined that what had entered into his mind before he would now do with the greatest care; namely, that, led by no one's authority, but persuaded by truth alone, he would adopt opinions on religious matters as they were formed in his own mind. The result was that whereas he often consulted with his foster-father and relatives on reforming certain errors, he hated schisms and oppressions and the offering of violence to the consciences of others with the greatest intensity; and finally he desired that a Church of this kind might be granted to him, in which should prevail not only toleration in bearing some errors, but a public *profession* of toleration.

DEATH OF ARMINIUS.

Celebrated at this time was JAMES ARMINIUS, a professor of theology in the Academy at Leyden, the fame of whose name and moderation was diffused upon the lips of men throughout the neighboring regions. And so our Curcellæus, moved by the reputation of Arminius, yet not without other reasons, determined to visit and consult foreign theologians. But when he came as far as Heidelberg, a sad message was brought, announcing the death of Arminius, which not a little afflicted the mind of Curcellæus, for he had taken a long journey especially to see and hear that eminent man. Thus deprived of his object, he turned back again to his own country, and thereupon, as we have said, was induced to enter upon the orders of the Church. He afterward lived on terms of friendship with Tilenus, Utenbogardus, Corvinus, and other eminent divines of the Church during their exile in France, from whose conversation, breathing and inspiring forbearance, he was enabled to make no contemptible progress in the study of toleration, as he often joyfully confessed. Nor when he departed from the intercourse and communion of these men did those sacred principles of toleration expire in his mind, but daily they attained an auspicious increase, and acquired that maturity in which, by the grace of God, we know that he firmly stood, flourished, and died.

PLEASING PICTURE OF HONORED MATURITY.

During his life he followed this path of love, that he might abundantly receive the grace of God and the favor of especially approved men. For why should he not be pleasing and acceptable to God, who so justly, piously, and earnestly advanced his kingdom in these lands, especially when there were so many other traits subsidiary to this virtue? For so great was his piety, that he would utter or think nothing concerning God, unless with an earnest devotedness and humility of spirit. So great was his temperance, that he was never known to indulge in ebriety, or to be allured by the snares of impurity. What need I say of his well-continued zeal, his prudence, humanity, affability, and singular gravity, all of which shone in his words, countenance, and every action? It was by reason of these things that he was constantly surrounded by the favor of good men. Hence he formed many abiding and most faithful friendships. A distance of places often destroys many intimacies with others: it is well known that this was never the case with our deceased friend. Not even in France did those friends, whose cause and doctrines he had repudiated, desert him. I call Rivetus* to witness, who always is accustomed to speak highly of him in his published books and letters. I appeal to Blondellus,† who desired to honor and embrace him as a brother. I also attest Dallæus,‡ who publicly lamented that he ever by any harsh words had grieved the most generous and friendly Curcellæus. Finally, I call to witness that eloquent old man Agnetus, who at Vitriacum was a colleague of our sage, and who remained with him and consoled him in his last afflicted moments.

Even those who cherished enmities toward Curcellæus have boasted that they did not hate him, but esteemed him as a friend. Molinaeus may be cited as an example, who, although not accused, yet excuses himself that he contributed nothing to his condemnation, nor was he a prosecutor or judge in this cause. And Sam-

* Andrew Rivet, a celebrated Dutch divine and controversialist. He assailed the mild Calvinism of Amyraldus and the philosophy of Descartes.

† David Blondel, a Protestant minister of Chalons, born in 1591 and died in 1655. He was author of "Eclaircissement sur l'Euchariste," and of an "Apoloogia per Sententia Sancti Hieronimi de Presbyteris et Episcopis."

‡ John Dailee, author of the well-known work on the Usage of the Fathers.

uel Maresius,* hostile as he was to our theology, claims to have cherished his friendship. I might cite others to this testimony who held him in veneration: the Petiti, the Voscii, consuls and men of consular rank, senators and men of senatorial rank; the Hasselarii, the Bassii, the Coccii, who never passed his door without pausing to enjoy conversation with him, and never allowed him undetained to pass their own. To him many were accustomed to resort, as if to the treasure-house of learning, the oracle of the state, the guardian of wisdom and humanity. If any weighty question perplexed the troubled minds of his disciples, he was ready to untie the difficult knot. If any one was to be commended or raised to a literary position, his opinion alone had more weight than that of many others. He alone was the representative of all. When he praised D. Blondell as a congenial friend, and meritedly illustrious for his learning, he uttered the sentence that caused the authorities of the institution to raise him to the high position of Professor of Ecclesiastical History. It was for this influence that the authorities of the state, as we have heard, esteemed him worthy of an honor never before bestowed, of the right of citizenship, conferred not by purchase, but by gift; not by petition, but by free-will. Although he was surrounded and assailed by the plots of many who were anxious to deprive him of life or bring him to trial, yet these noblemen, fathers of their country, guardians of innocence, determined to guard and defend him by their own protection and by the privileges of citizenship. If, then, strangers (although who could be a stranger who so greatly favors him, and by him favors us?) who were separated from us in external communion, cherished this man with such honor, with what love ought we to embrace him, who enjoyed by daily intercourse his learning, and experienced so often his kindnesses? If others ought to grieve at his decease, how much more his dearest son and most beloved daughter?

* Samuel Maresius (Des Marets) was a leading Calvinistic divine of the seventeenth century. He was a Picard, born in 1599, studied at Saumur under Gomarus and Capellus. He became Professor of Divinity at Sedan, and was afterward Professor at Gronigen. He was a very fierce disputant. Bayle celebrates the warmth and persistency of his debate with Vœtius, as well as the heat but brevity of his warfare with Dailec. His bitterness toward Curcellæus, therefore, was only a part of a system or permanent habit. He might be called the Toplady of his day.

DECLINING YEARS AND EXULTING EXIT.

Yet so sad was his affliction, so severe and lasting were his pains, that he sought consolation in the hope of approaching death. But let us congratulate ourselves that he was enabled to endure even for ten years an ulcer upon the bladder, and so endure that physicians and surgeons declared that nothing less than death could be expected. There was a certain one in France at this time, who, upon the reception of the news of his decease, insulted and persecuted him with a funeral song. For not as a deceased man did he honor him with any heraldry of respect, but he composed this funeral dirge, as if he would tear to pieces his manes and bones, ferociously insulting him as a dead lion, especially because he had not written concerning the law of God to his creatures as illimitably and vaguely as they wished; for which reason this poetaster did not fear to adjudge him to hell. Truly our God was above medical skill, and a despiser of calumnies and calumniators, who restored him to health, and raising him as if from the dead, quickly silenced the song of that wicked man, and showed that nothing had been done contrary to the law of God, but that all his thoughts and arguments had been to God's glory in the denial that God was able or willing to cast the helpless souls of innocent children into hell. As the phenix, according to report, revives fresher from its own ashes, so Curcellæus, struggling from the shadow of death, entirely regained a new life, and for his advanced years obtained well-established health. He also produced from that time a fruitful progeny of pupils, so that he strengthened and adorned the greater part of the Churches with a new generation of offspring and supporters.

His seventieth year being passed, he perceived his strength diminishing, and felt his incompetency for performing his former great labors. Tossed like a light bark on those rocks of disease near which had been his former danger, a year had almost elapsed since the time when, in letters to our venerable synod, he explained the state of his health, and asked that measures might be taken by the officary, the brothers alike to the seminary and himself, concerning a successor and colleague. The greatest share of the subsequent time he passed upon his bed,

under the severest anguish from his bladder, until the twentieth day of this month, when liberated from every affliction, absolved from every trial of pain, he surrendered his soul to the God whence it was derived and given.

I will not in this place deplore the brevity of human life or the sorrowful vicissitudes of our deceased sage; nor will I exclaim, with the most eloquent of orators, "O, fallacious hope, and fragile fortune, and vain contentions of men, which fall, are broken, and overwhelmed in mid career!" For this orator, howsoever eloquent, was not a Christian, nor was he able to appreciate in spirit or mind the extent and firmness of our hope. Moreover, we may learn from the deceased how we ought to be composed and animated; for as he was not free from the experience of pain and anguish, so he bore his sufferings with a calm and patient spirit. Taking occasion from his trials, we may learn the most arduous yet noble virtue of patience; for he dreaded not approaching death, but desired it, and panted that it might come with prayers and supplications, because he knew that from death alone was there repose from labors and anguish, and by that same route his path to eternal life.

First, from a copy of the Psalms of David, whence the full streams of solace flow, he frequently desired selections to be read. Then he turned himself to prayer, in which he was aided by other reverend colleagues, and especially by the reverend Prævostius, with whom also he had maintained extensive conversations concerning the immortality of the soul and the state subsequent to departure. In all this conversation he attested his faith in God and Christ to be immovable, and his hope in every respect unshaken. In his last moments he exclaimed, "My God! My Father!" Then, turning to his surrounding children and friends, "For this hour," said he, "all things are well. I am calmly composed; I am exultant." So therefore this faithful servant of God finished his last contest, completed his course, and attained that faith in Christ, of which the end is the crown of righteousness, the salvation of the soul, and joy eternal. He believed this reward of his labors to be laid up in heaven. That this was his reward we confidently believe and trust; which source of consolation alone surpasses in value every other solace. And that not too sad or lamented should

be the recollection of that day in which he was taken from our eyes, God himself, the God of consolations, has abundantly provided. For upon that day in which we Christians joyfully celebrate with sacred commemoration the glorious ascension of Christ into heaven, did Stephen Curcellæus ascend from the earth. How can that day seem sorrowful or calamitous to us in which Christ, borne into heaven, gloriously triumphed over mortality and death, over superior and inferior powers. Stephen, the proto-martyr, when driven from life, exclaimed on bended knees, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Our Stephen also imitated this prayer in that last dedication which he inscribed to the faithful servants of Christ, to the pastors of the Reformed Church in the Isle of France, in Campagne and Picardy; desired to record for all that he had entirely expunged from his own mind every memory of injury or offense; for whom he offered his prayers to God that they might see the truth and embrace charity. I exhort them, therefore, to receive with magnanimity the last address of this eminent man. I beseech that if they hated him, (although who was able to hate him? nevertheless they did not love him because they did not know him,) that at least they may desist to hate him dead, who while living hated not them, but loved, and left a living testimony of the fact to survive his life. Ever will live that testimony of his forgetfulness of injury in our hearts, nor ever by any forgetfulness of men or injury of time will it be obliterated.

ART. VIII.—FOREIGN RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

PROTESTANTISM.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE RATIONALISTIC CONTROVERSY.—As was to be expected, the bold advocacy of Rationalistic views by Bishop Colenso has not only awakened a new interest in the Rationalistic controversy, but also greatly increased its importance for the future destiny of the Church of England. Although there was at first a general doubt how the Church ought

to deal with him, there was also a general expression of opinion among the clergy that something ought to be done to vindicate the orthodoxy of the Church. Several of the bishops early denounced in severe terms the heterodox views of Bishop Colenso, and declared that they would not allow him to officiate in their dioceses. On February 5 a meeting of the bishops belonging to the Convocation of Canterbury took place, at which there was a unanimous condemnation

of Bishop Colenso's book, though a small minority differed from the rest as to the mode in which it was most expedient to act. The prevailing opinion seemed to be that action should be taken through Bishop Colenso's immediate metropolitan, the Bishop of Capetown; but as this prelate is known to belong to the ultra High Church School, the evangelical party expressed some fear of intrusting to him proceedings of so grave importance. On February 10 the Convocation of Canterbury met, and, according to general expectation, took up at once the case of Bishop Colenso. On the second day, February 11, Archdeacon Denison, having obtained the suspension of the standing orders, moved an address to the upper house, praying the upper house "to direct the appointment of a committee to examine a book lately published in London, within the province of Canterbury, entitled 'The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined,' by the Rt. Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal, and to report whether any, and, if any, what opinions heretical or erroneous in doctrine are contained in said book." Mr. Denison quoted two passages from the preface, in which he said the bishop denied the truth of Scripture, and impugned the authority of Jesus Christ. He could not avoid observing that it was impossible for the house to pass by such a matter as this. The motion was seconded by Dr. M'Caul, who considered the book published by Bishop Colenso a great scandal to the Church. Dr. M'Caul said he could tell of one who on going up for priest's orders spoke publicly in a railway carriage of the unanswerableness of the book, and yet he was not deterred from going up to repeat the most solemn act of ordination. Archdeacon Honey believed that the course proposed would be ineffectual for any good purpose, and would only give a larger circulation to the book, and he therefore moved as an amendment, "That it is inexpedient that any steps should be taken in Convocation with a view to revive the power of censuring books or authors." This amendment was supported by the Archdeacon of Stafford, who thought it extremely unwise for the house to establish itself into a court to pass judgment on questions of heresy. The Dean of Canterbury thought the house, by appointing a committee to inquire into this particular

book, would become a standing committee to examine into all books, forming as it were an expurgatorial committee. The original motion was, among others, supported by Dr. Jelf. The amendment being put to vote was negatived. Archdeacon Browne then moved the following amendment: "That this house, deeply deploring the scandal on the Church and the danger to the faith of Christ which have arisen from the publication of the Bishop of Natal, but doubting as to the steps it may be desirable to take in order to remove the scandal and counteract the danger, respectfully request his grace the president, and their lordships the bishops of the upper house, to take counsel as to the wisest and most legal mode of proceeding; and this house assures his grace and their lordships the bishops of their readiness to co-operate with them in the course most fitting, and most likely to be fruitful and good." Archdeacon Denison, in opposing this amendment, said that a refusal of the house to inquire into the very worst case that had happened in the Church for the last two hundred years, would ruin the convocation in the eyes of the public more than any other course that could be pursued. The amendment of Archdeacon Browne was then negatived, and the original motion adopted. On February 13 the resolution of the lower house, desiring the appointment of a committee to examine the book of Bishop Colenso, came up in the upper house, when the Bishops of London and St. David's opposed the appointment of a committee, which measure was on the other hand advocated by the Bishops of Llandaff and Lincoln, and finally adopted by the house. The lower house, on the same, appointed the committee of investigation. The most decided opponent of the measure is the Bishop of London, who some time before, in a pastoral charge, expressly deprecated all resort to legal prosecutions, except in extreme cases, to repress free thought, reminding his clergy that "after all we are Protestants," and who openly avowed that he would relax rather than tighten the terms of subscription. The new Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Longley, who is regarded as belonging to or, at all events, leaning toward the High Church School, in reply to the address of the clergy of the rural deanery of Chesterfield had declared: "No effort shall be wanting on

my part, nor, I trust, on the part of my right reverend brethren, to vindicate the faith of the Church in this instance, as far as it is in our power to do so."

On December 15 the judgment of the Court of Arches in the matter of the *Essays and Reviews* was pronounced. Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson were pronounced to have departed from the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles, on the subject of Holy Scripture being the written word of God, on the atonement and on justification, and they were therefore subjected to the punishment of suspension for one year, with payment of costs. How such suspension, without public acknowledgment of error, is to alter the position of their return to their offices in the Church it is difficult to understand. The question will come next before the Privy Council, but the decision will probably be maintained.

Against another one of the Essayists, Professor Jowett, an action has been commenced in the Chancellor's Court, Oxford, by Dr. Pusey, Dr. Heurtley, and Dr. Ogilvie. Some time before a case had been submitted to the Queen's Advocate, Sir Robert Phillimore, whether Professor Jowett had so distinctly contravened the doctrine of the Church of England that a court of law would pronounce him guilty. The Queen's Advocate had pointed out various passages in the professor's work which in his opinion were at variance with the doctrines of the Church of England. The proceedings against Professor Jowett created great interest in Oxford.

AFRICA.

THE PROTESTANT MISSION IN MADAGASCAR.—The territory of Protestantism in Africa, which now comprises the English possessions, the Republic of Liberia, the Protestants of Algeria, and a number of missionary congregations among various Pagan tribes, is likely to receive soon a large and important addition by the advancing Christianization of the island of Madagascar. Madagascar exceeds in extent France, having an area of about 240,000 square miles, with a population of about 3,000,000 inhabitants. Protestant missions were first established under King Radama I., who ascended the throne in 1808. The missionaries of the London Missionary Society (since 1818) reduced the native language to writing, translated and pre-

pared the Bible, taught in the course of about ten years about 15,000 of the natives to read, and converted a large number to Christianity. The death of Radama, in 1828, put, however, a stop to the progress of the Protestant missions. The widow and successor of the King, Ranavalona, closed the schools, drove the missionaries from the island in 1836, prohibited the profession of Christianity, and tried to exterminate the Christian congregations. In 1846 the queen's son, Radama, then seventeen years old, embraced Christianity, which through his influence began again to spread, although the Christians continued to suffer persecution at the hands of the queen. The death of the latter in 1861, and the accession to the throne of her Christian son, Radama II., opened again the whole island to the preaching of Christianity. The London Missionary Society made at once preparations for reoccupying the field, and Rev. Mr. Ellis, whose former missionary labors in the island had made him fully familiar with the native Christians and the character of the entire people, was sent back to Madagascar. He arrived at Antananarivo, the capital, about the middle of June, and was received with great cordiality and joy by the king and the officers of the government. When Mr. Ellis mentioned the number and the specific objects of the several missionaries on their way to Madagascar, with the supply of books, school materials, and printing apparatus which they would bring, both king and queen thanked him for the communication, and requested him to assure their friends that it was peculiarly gratifying to them. The prime minister, the commander-in-chief, the first officer of the palace, and other high authorities, some of them apparently most earnest Christians, were equally cordial in their welcomes. Mr. Ellis has been requested by the king to attend him daily for two hours to read with him. They read together out of a large Bible, presented, in 1821, by the London Missionary Society to King Radama I. Besides, he began at once to instruct daily at his house eleven or twelve sons of the chief nobles and officers, and this class was soon joined by the adopted son of the queen. Mr. Ellis was well pleased with the religious feeling among the native congregations, and he found that the Christians were still numerous. According to a report made

by the native pastors, their number amounts to about 7,000. Mr. Ellis says that their piety and fortitude were making a great impression upon the rest of the population, who crowd to hear the Gospel proclaimed. He has asked the London Missionary Society for £10,000 to build spacious places of worship on the spots consecrated by the martyrdoms and tortures of the native converts. The king has with alacrity appropriated the sites; he and his Christian people will do what they can toward raising the required buildings, but they will be unable to finish the work without aid from abroad.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES.

RUSSIA.

INTERCOMMUNION BETWEEN THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES AND THE RUSSIAN CHURCH.—For several years members of the High Church Party of the Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country have tried to open negotiations with members of the Eastern Churches, and in particular the Russian State Church, with a view of preparing the way for an ultimate union of all the Eastern and the Anglican Churches. Of late this movement has assumed large dimensions, and there is already a great probability that ere long it may become one of the great ecclesiastical events of the nineteenth century. The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, held last year in the city of New York, appointed a committee to consider the question of "establishing intercommunion with the Russo-Greek Church." The debate on this subject awakened a particular interest among the friends of this movement in England, and called forth a letter from the Rev. George Williams, of King's College, Cambridge, who has had for some time close relations with many prelates and members of the Eastern Churches, and who on that account offers his services to the American committee. Mr. Williams, in 1860, published, in concert with his friend, Dr. Wolff, proposals for the establishment of a hostel for members of the Orthodox Greek Church in the University of Cambridge; and also, in the same year, went to Russia, to explain to the higher ecclesiastics the principles on which they proposed to conduct the hostel. He

conversed with many of their eminent religious men, and ascertained their disposition toward the Anglican Church. Previously Mr. Williams had resided there for eighteen months, and gained a good knowledge of the Russian Church and people. Mr. Williams expresses the opinion that any advance toward the establishment of relations of amity with the Russo-Greek Church would have a much better prospect of success if made by the two Churches in concert than by either alone, and he therefore suggests to the American committee the desirableness of applying to the English Convocation, and inviting them to appoint a committee to correspond and co-operate with the American committee in this business, in order that all that may be done may be the joint action of the two Churches.

In order to show the views of the bishops of England respecting this matter, Mr. Williams further states, that on the occasion of his visiting Russia in 1860, not only did his own diocesan, the Bishop of Lincoln, and the Bishop of Oxford give him letters commendatory of the most formal character to the Metropolitans of Russia, and to the Holy Governing Synod, as well as to the patriarchs and others of the Eastern Churches; but others of the English bishops, including the present Archbishop of Canterbury, expressed their hearty interest in the matter, and gave him less formal letters of amity to the same Churches. Besides these he had letters from Bishop Potter, of Pennsylvania, and from several of the Colonial bishops. These letters, he thinks, produced a most favorable impression in Russia, and a record of the fact of their presentation, with the names of the bishops whose signatures they bore, was entered on the Minutes of the Synod.

Mr. Williams also states that he has already taken some action in the matter upon his own responsibility. He wrote to an intimate Russian friend, a count, who has close relations with many learned and influential members of his own Church, ecclesiastics and others, to ask him if he could offer any suggestions as to the best method of proceeding in this delicate business. The answer of the count, which is dated Jan. 4, (16,) 1863, expresses the opinion that the present time is more favorable than those selected for former attempts were, but that it would be better to prepare the

minds of the Russian people for such advances before actually making them. The count promises to use the religious press of Russia to this end, and to communicate with the confessor of the emperor and one of the Russian metropolitans. As to the best manner to make the advances, he thinks that it would be best to send some properly accredited deputy to the Holy Synod, with a letter containing the proposals which it is desired to make.

The Convocation of Canterbury, which met on February 10, 1863, had also a discussion on the subject of opening communication with the Russian Church, and the lower house declared itself unanimously in favor of it.

TURKEY.

THE BULGARIANS.—THE UNITED BULGARIAN CHURCH.—If we may believe the Roman Catholic organs, the movement among the Bulgarians for a union with Rome is again making great progress. It is asserted that the first bishop of the Church, Sokolski, who had been consecrated by the pope himself, had never left the Church again, but had been carried off against his will by the Russians, and was now retained by them in a Russian convent. The pope is said, in an energetic note, to have recently demanded his release. The United Bulgarian Church has now a patriarch at Constantinople and an archbishop at Philipopolis. They have been recognized by the Turkish government as a political community, but they cannot take over with them to the new Church the edifices in which they formerly worshipped. These remain to the Greek Church, and the United Bulgarians have to build new chapels. They have a journal in Constantinople, called *Bulgaria*, which for some time was suspended, but has now been revived, and exercises a considerable influence, because the literature of the Bulgarians, which is of very recent origin, has as yet but very few periodicals. Toward the close of the year 1862 the Roman Catholic papers announced that a Bulgarian archbishop had made his submission to the pope; but later this news was modified, to the effect that the Archbishop of Sophia, on December 9, 1862, applied for admission to the communion of the Roman Catholic Church; and that the same application was made a few days after by the assistant Bishop of Adrian-

ople, but that it was found out that both applications had been made from purely mercenary motives, and that they were therefore refused. The two bishops succeeded in inducing five or six young Bulgarians, who were on the point of going to Rome to make their theological studies in the Propaganda, to return with them to the Greek Church. The United Bulgarians are especially numerous in the province of Adrianople, where their total number in April, 1862, was stated to be 2,612 families. More recently the movement is said to be particularly strong in the diocese of Tirmovo, and Roman Catholic papers already announce the "conversion" of the whole diocese. This is undoubtedly an exaggeration, but the actual transition of a number of clergymen and families rests on good authority. In the town of Tirmovo about one hundred families have joined the United Church, and are about to build a chapel.

Very little has been heard during the past year of the national party among the Bulgarians which is opposed to a union with Rome. Since March, 1862, Bishop Parthenios has been at the head of this party, whose prospects are said to have suffered by the accession to the throne of the present sultan. The Bulgarians have somewhat changed their programme, and now demand only a national clergy, the use of the Bulgarian language at the mass, Bulgarian schools, and a thorough reformation of the abuses in the administration of the Church. As regards the supreme ecclesiastical government, they are willing to remain under the patriarch of Constantinople, if six bishops (just one half) of the Holy Governing Synod be taken from their nation.

PROGRESS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN SYRIA.—It is said that numerous congregations of the Greek Church in the Plain of Damascus and in the country between Lebanon and Balbeck, are joining the Church of Rome. As the main cause of this movement, the liberal donations are regarded which are received from France for the support of the Christian population of Syria. At the head of the Romanizing movement is the former Greek bishop of the town of Holms. He has solemnly joined the Roman Catholic Church, and as he is a man of great influence in Syria, it is believed that many will follow his example. A particular zeal for the interests

of the Roman Catholic Church in Syria is displayed by the Paris "Association for Establishing Christian Schools in the East," in which not only zealous Roman Catholics, but also, from political motives, many prominent French statesmen take an active part. The bulletin of this society claims that more than four thousand "schismatics," among whom were several priests, have already joined the communion of Rome, and that many others are on the point of following them. Rome has a number of able agents in Syria, none of whom has done more for the Church than Patriarch Valerga of Jerusalem, who has been laboring in these regions for his Church since 1840, and has been recently appointed by the pope delegate for Syria. Since he has occupied the patriarchal see of Jerusalem he has established a seminary for the training of a native clergy at Beitehalla, and a new hospital at Jerusalem; has introduced communities of nuns, for the education of female children and the nursing of the sick, into Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Jaffa, St. Jean d'Acre, Caiffa, and Chef-Amar, and obtained the restoration to the Roman Catholics of a number of places in Palestine which formerly belonged to them.

INDIA.

IMPORTANT MOVEMENT IN THE SYRIAN CHURCH OF INDIA.—Among the

least known branches of the Eastern Churches belong the Syrian Church in Travancore, India, often called the Christians of Saint Thomas. When the Portuguese, in the fifteenth century, established themselves on the coast of India, they tried to compel the members of this ancient Church to submit to the pope. A large portion of the Church complied, while another portion retained its independence. The latter are estimated at some seventy thousand, while the former counted about one hundred and fifty thousand, of whom ninety-six thousand, the United Syrian Church, with ninety-seven Churches, still followed the ancient rite of their Church, while the others have entirely identified themselves with the Latin rite. In the United Syrian Church (which had adopted the faith of Rome, but preserved its ancient rite) of late a remarkable movement is said to have taken place. The missionaries of the Church Missionary Society of England report that a deputation has been sent by this Church to the Jacobites of Mesopotamia, and that one of the delegates was consecrated a bishop, who on his return to Travancore declared for a separation from Rome. With scarcely any exception, writes a missionary, all the Syro-Romanists gave in their adherence to the new bishop, and the Romish bishop was left with not more than ten or twelve parishes.

ART. IX.—FOREIGN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

ENGLAND.

Dr. ETHERIDGE, author of the life of Adam Clarke and a biography of Coke, has just published a *Translation of the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uzziel*; with fragments from the Jerusalem Targum; from the Chaldee. The present volume covers Genesis and Exodus. The *London (Wesleyan) Quarterly* says:

It is superfluous to say that Dr. Etheridge makes his Aramaic speak as good English as Aramaic can, and that his renderings put the reader in possession both of the spirit and form of the original texts. Prefixed to the translation is an introductory chapter on the origin, history, and character of the Targums; and what greatly heightens the value of this

part of the work, two brief but elaborate episodes are wrought into it, in which the author discusses the great questions of the teaching of the paraphrasts respecting the Divine Logos, and the testimony which they bear to the Scripture doctrine of the Messiah. Those who are acquainted with Dr. Etheridge's previous writings will not need to be told, that the learning which these prolegomena exhibit is large and trustworthy, and that the value of the information they contain is equalled only by the manly modesty, the well-disciplined judgment, and the tender yet noble Christian feeling which pervade and adorn every production of his pen.

A pamphlet of some sixty-eight pages has been published by Mason, consisting of "*Two Lectures on the Wesleyan Hymn*

Book, by the Rev. Joseph Heaton." The first lecture is devoted to biographical sketches of the authors of the hymns. The second is a dissertation on the hymns themselves. The lectures are eulogized very highly.

The theological agitations of the day in England have induced Trübner to publish "*Spinoza's Critical Inquiry in the Hebrew Scriptures*." It was originally written in Latin; but the destructives conceive that it is time to bring its views within the reach of the multitudes who read English alone. *The Westminster Review* says:

He treats first of prophecy and the prophets; he considers the form of Hebrew prophecy in its more remarkable characteristics to be due to an excitement of the "imagination," its end and scope to concern moral and spiritual truths. In his chapter on law, divine and human, he distinguishes between the law of eternal and universal truth and verity, and the law of precept and application; and he says of the Mosaic laws that they were apprehended by the Hebrew legislator not as universal truths, but as particular institutes. We should be glad for English readers who have only heard of Spinoza as an anti-Christian and an atheist, to remark what follows: "From this point of view are those prophets to be regarded who have uttered laws in the name of God. But Christ is an exception to this rule. Of him I hold we are to opine that he perceived things immediately, adequately, truly; for Christ, though he also appears to have enunciated laws in the name of God, was not so much a prophet as he was the mouth of God. When we say that God revealed himself immediately to Christ, (that is, to the mind of Christ,) and not mediately as to the prophets by words and signs, nothing more is to be understood than that Christ perceived revealed things truly, adequately, and in themselves, or that he comprehended them; for then is a thing really comprehended when it is perceived by the mind itself without the intervention of signs. Christ, therefore, perceived revealed things in themselves and adequately; so that if he ever prescribed them as rules or laws, it was because of the ignorance and obstinacy of the people he addressed. Standing as the substitute of God, he accommodated himself to the capacity of the vulgar, and spoke more clearly than the prophets generally had done, though still somewhat obscurely, often teaching by parables, especially when he was addressing those to whom it was not yet given to understand celestial things."—Pp. 97, 98.

Spinoza's doctrine as to the value of

the biblical histories is, that they do not of themselves form part of the divine revelation, and do not all of them, or necessarily in all cases, contribute to make men better or more spiritual, but are only of use so far as they do this, and in reference to the moral doctrines they contain: by reason, however, of their containing and illustrating these moral doctrines more fully than other histories, the Bible histories are superior to all others. Then follows a most able chapter on Miracles, the sum of which may be gathered from the ensuing definition of the word: "From these premises, therefore, namely, that nothing happens in nature which does not follow from its laws; that these laws extend to all which enters into the divine mind; and lastly, that nature proceeds in a fixed and changeless course; it follows most obviously that the word miracle can only be understood in relation to the opinions of mankind, and signifies nothing more than an event, a phenomenon, the cause of which cannot be explained by another familiar instance, or in any case which the narrator is unable to explain."—P. 124.

A London rector of the Established Church, said to occupy an important position, has published a work entitled "*Forgiveness after Death; does the Bible or the Church of England affirm it to be impossible?*" He maintains that in spite of the equivocal terms "everlasting fire" in the Athanasian Creed, and "everlasting death" in the Catechism, the literal eternity of the misery of the damned is not an obligatory Church belief. The Church standards, he avers, contain nothing like those words of the Scotch Presbyterian Church, defining the penalty of the wicked to be "everlasting separation from the comfortable presence of God, and most grievous torments in soul and body, without intermission, in hell-fire forever." In regard to the intentional exclusion of the doctrine of endless misery from the standards of the Church of England, this rector gives the following remarkable statement:

But what proves beyond the possibility of doubt that the silence of our own Church was deliberate and intentional, is the fact that in the Articles adopted in the year 1552, there was one relating to this very subject which afterward was simply omitted. This Article, the 42d, and last of that earlier code, was headed, "All men shall not be saved at the length," and ran as follows: "They also are worthy of condemnation who endeavor at this time to restore the dangerous opinion that all men, be they

never so ungodly, shall at length be saved, when they have suffered pains for their sins a certain time appointed by God's justice." The Article was wholly withdrawn in the course of ten years, and the Church of England has virtually pronounced that no dogma on the subject of future punishment shall be binding upon her clergy or her members.—P. 21.

GERMANY.

The highly important collective work on the Lives of the Fathers of the Reformed Church, (*Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Reformirten Kirche. Elberfeld.*) with selections from their writings, which has been for several years in the course of publication under the superintendence of Professor Hagenbach, has now been completed by the appearance of volume nine, containing the second half of the *Life of Calvin*, by Stähelin, and volume ten, containing the *Life of John Knox*, by F. Brandes. All the theological periodicals of Germany commend the work as one of the very best that has for some time appeared in the department of theological literature. The counterpart of it, which embraces the *Lives and Select Writings of the Fathers of the Lutheran Church*, and is edited by the venerable Dr. Nitzsch, is likewise rapidly approaching completion. Four volumes have hitherto been published, having the following contents: volume one, Melancthon; volume two, Urbanus Rhegius; volume three, J. Brenz; volume four contains P. Speratus, C. Cruciger, N. von Amsdorf, M. Chemnitz, J. Jonas, L. Spengler, P. Eber, Dr. Chytraeus. The following four volumes, which will conclude the work, will contain "Luther," in two volumes, "Osiander," and "Bugenhausen."

One of the most important Bible works, when completed, will be that published by Professor Lange, of Bonn, which has, in addition to the matter found in most of the German commentaries, a "*Homiletical Commentary*," pointing out the application which may be made of the matter contained in every chapter or section of a biblical book for sermons. Professor Lange himself has furnished the commentaries to the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John, and together with a theologian of Holland, Dr. von Oosterzee, that to the Epistles of James. Dr. von Oosterzee has besides written the commentaries to Luke, the Pastoral

Epistles, and the Epistle to Philemon. The other volumes, thus far published, contain the Acts, by Dr. G. Lechler and K. Gerok; the Epistles to the Corinthians, by Dr. C. F. Kling; the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, by Schmoller; the Epistles to the Ephesians, Philipians, and Colossians, by Professor Schenkel; the Epistle to the Hebrews, by Dr. Moll; the Epistles of Peter and the Epistle of Jude, by Dr. Frommüller.

Of the Bible work of Bunsen the New Testament part has been commenced, to be edited by Professor Holtzmann, of Heidelberg, who has also recently published a work on the Synoptical Gospels, their origin and historical character. (*Die Synoptischen Evangelien, ihr Ursprung und Geschichtlicher Character.* Leipsic, 1863: pp. 530.)

The professors of the Evangelical Theological Faculty at Strasburg, France, Reuss, Cunitz, and Baum, are on the point of publishing *The Complete Works of Calvin*, printed and manuscript. Every year about two volumes will be published, and the whole work will contain about twenty volumes. The price of a volume will be \$4.

Friends of German literature will be glad to learn that Mr. Perthes of Gotha, the publisher of a large number of the standard theological works of Germany, has begun to publish, under the name Theological Library, (*Theologische Bibliothek.* Gotha, 1862,) a cheap and uniform edition of the works of Dr. Neander, Dr. Ullmann, Dr. Umbreit, and Dr. Tholuck. The "Library" will contain the "*Apostelgeschichte*," "*Leben Jesu*," "*Kirchengeschichte*," "*Heilige Bernhard, Denkwürdigkeiten*," "*Kaiser Julian, Kleine Abhandlungen*," by Dr. Neander; "*Propheten des Alten Bundes, Erbauung aus dem Psalter, Der Körnerbrief, die Sünde*," and four other works by Dr. Umbreit; "*Lehre von der Sünde, Predigten, Studien der Andacht, Berg Predigt, Evangelium Johannis, Hebräerbrief, Alles Testament im N. T., Propheten*" and four other works by Dr. Tholuck; "*Sündlosigkeit Jesu, Reformatoren, wesen des Christenthums*," and two other works by Dr. Ullmann. All these works are well known to belong among the classic works of modern German theology.

The celebrated *Codex Sinaiticus*, which Professor Tischendorf, the discoverer, considers to be the most ancient

and important manuscript of the Bible, has now been printed at the expense of the Russian government, in an edition of three hundred copies, all of which were intended by the Russian government for presents. Subsequently the emperor has, however, given to Professor Tischendorf one hundred copies for the book-trade, and they are for sale at \$230 a copy. The claim of the Greek Simonides, a well-known literary forger, that the manuscript was written by himself, has not found many believers in the literary world.

Of the long expected work of the Chevalier de Rossi, *Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romanae septimo saeculo anteriores*, the first volume (price \$36) has been recently published. The whole work will embrace more than eleven thousand inscriptions, which in this work are for the first time arranged, explained, and illustrated by accurate fac-similes.

A complete *History of Scholastic Philosophy* has been recently commenced by Dr. W. Kaulich, a young professor of philosophy at the University of Prague. (*Geschichte der Scholastischen Philosophie*, vol. 1. Prague, 1863.) Germany had hitherto done less for the history of philosophy during the middle ages than France, which has produced some excellent works on the subject. As more recently a number of formerly unknown works of the middle ages had been discovered and edited, and new light has been shed on many points by critical editions of the complete works of some of the great mediæval scholars, a new work on scholastic philosophy, embodying all the results of recent investigations, had become a great want. The author, who has already made himself known to philosophical scholars by a work on *Scotus Erigena*, has especially tried to show up the connection between the philosophical attempts at the beginning of the scholastic period, and to trace the ideas which underlie the whole speculative moment and the influences which conditioned its development.

One of the greatest philosophical writers of Germany, Professor Heinrich Ritter, of Göttingen, has commenced the publication of an *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences*. (*Encyclopädie der Philosophischen Wissenschaften*, vol. 1. Göttingen, 1862.) The author intends to examine critically the philosoph-

ical systems which have been hitherto brought forward, and tries to find the real results which may be gained from them for a new system. The first volume contains the introduction, and investigations on science in general. Of the two following volumes, which are soon to appear, one will be devoted to natural and one to ethical science.

The distinguished author of the work on Christian Ethics, Professor Richard Rothe, has published, in book form, a series of articles on "Dogmatics," which had appeared in the *Studien und Kritiken*, of which Rothe is now one of the editors. (*Zur Dogmatik*. Heidelberg, 1863.) These articles have called forth a great deal of discussion among the German theologians. Rothe differs widely from the old orthodox school of theologians, and in particular attacks the belief in a verbal inspiration of the Scriptures; on the other hand, however, he strongly advocates the supernatural element of Christianity in particular miracles. The volume contains three articles, the first of which treats of the conception of evangelical doctrines, the second of revelation, and the third of the Holy Scriptures.

A new work on the *Sacrificial Rites of the Old Testament* has been published by the Church historian, J. H. Kurtz. (*Der Alttestamentliche Opfercultus*. Mitau, 1862.) The author divides his work into four parts. The first treats of the general bases of the sacrificial rites of the Old Testament; the second, of the bloody sacrifice, both in its totality and of the different kinds; the third, of the unbloody sacrifice; and the fourth, of the rites customary at particular times and occasions. The author published, as early as 1842, a book on the "Mosaic Sacrifice," (*Das Mosaische Opfer*.) and intended at first to give this in a thoroughly revised edition; but other theological work delayed this project longer than was at first intended, and the lectures which the author had more recently to give on Biblical Archaeology, induced him to prepare an entirely new work on the subject.

Dr. Hugo Læmer, formerly lecturer on Protestant Theology at the University of Berlin, and now a Roman Catholic priest, has published a new work on the result of his researches in the libraries of Rome. He assures us that during the first year of his stay in

Rome, until July, 1860, he read through and made extracts from more than one hundred and seventy volumes of historical and theological manuscripts. The most important results of these studies for ecclesiastical history he published, in 1861, in a work entitled *Analectha Romana*. From September, 1860, until his departure from Rome, he worked through two hundred and five other manuscripts, mostly found in the libraries of S. Croce in Jerusalemme, S. Pietro in Vincoli, Angelica, and Corsimiana, and his discoveries in these four libraries he has made public in a volume entitled, *Contributions to the Church History of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. (*Zur Kirchengeschichte des 16 und 17 Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg, 1863.) The work is designed as a forerunner to a larger work, entitled *Spicilegium Romanum Historico-Ecclesiasticum*, of which the first volume is soon to be issued.

The History of Protestant Theology, (*Frank, Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie*, vol. 1. Leipzig, 1862. 8vo. xii, 428 pp.), by Gustav Frank, Professor at Jena, is the first complete work on a subject of great interest for all friends of theological science. The numerous histories of Christian doctrines which modern Germany has produced had created a general demand for a good and comprehensive history of theology, and the theological faculties of nearly all the German universities have commenced to provide for a regular course of lectures on the subject. On some periods we have, moreover, received a series of excellent works, as, on rationalism, the works of Tholuck Räckert, and others on modern theology by Karl Schwarz. But the above work of Frank is the first which embraces within its scope the whole range of Protestant theology, principally, of course, in the land of the author, from Luther down to the present time. The author divides the "History of Protestant Theology" into the following three periods: the first extends from Luther to Gerhard, 1517-1648. It is the period of fermentation, which results in stability. The second, from 1648 to 1750, unfolds the contest between stability and progress, beginning with the Gnosticism of Calixt and concluding with the philosophy of Wolff. The first one, according to our author, in which Protestantism has brought about a legitimate marriage between theology

and philosophy. The third period begins, in 1750, with the German enlightenment, and extends to the present time; it is the period of development. The first period, embraced within the first volume, just published, is subdivided by the author into four divisions. The first, from 1517 to 1746, he calls the heroic age of the Church; the second, from 1546 to 1580, the post-classic period; the third, from 1580 to 1600, the period of confessional polemics; and the fourth, from 1600 to 1648, the time of orthodox systematicism.

The keen and immense learning of the late Professor F. C. Baur, the founder and head of the so-called Tübingen school, have been so generally acknowledged that his posthumous work on the Church History of the Nineteenth Century (*Baur, F. C. Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche*. Vol. 5. Tübingen, 1862. xiv, 557 pp.) is sure to find many readers. The work consists of the lectures on Modern Church History, which the late author used to give at the University of Tübingen during every summer since 1850. It is divided into three parts, the first of which contains the time from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the year 1815. The second the time from 1815 to 1830. The third the time from 1830 to 1861. In each period he first traces the history of the Roman Catholic, and next that of the Protestant Church. An introduction to each period describes its political complexion. The work is mostly confined to the history of the Protestant German State Churches; but in the third part treats also of the Protestant Churches of Catholic Germany, of the non-German Protestant Churches, and the sects of modern times.

FRANCE.

The correspondence of a man like Lacordaire will, of course, find many attentive readers. The first installment of it, consisting for the most part of letters addressed by Lacordaire to his former pupils, has been published by Abbé Perreyve. (*Lettres du Reverend Pere Lacordaire à des Jeunes Gens*. Paris, 1862.) The celebrated Dominican monk, who remained faithful to the liberal and democratic principles which he professed as representative of the people in the Constituent Assembly of 1848,

was excluded by the French emperor from the pulpits of Paris, and spent the last years of his life as teacher in an educational institute which he had revived at Sorèze. His relation to his pupils was very intimate, and he retained a great influence on all who had once been under his instruction. Shortly before his death he summed up his profession of faith by avowing himself "a penitent Christian and an impenitent liberal." He was one of the great pulpit orators of the age, and the French Academy bore witness to his literary merits by electing him a member, an honor which, for more than one hundred and fifty years, had not been conferred upon another monk.

One of the prominent Christian mystics of the present century was the French philosopher Saint Martin. Chateaubriand calls him a man of great merit, of a noble and independent character, whose ideas (when they were explicable) were of an elevated and superior nature. Madame de Stael, M. de Maistre, the German philosopher Baader, Cousin, and Saint Beuve, studied his works, and tried to initiate the world into his ideas. Saint Martin has recently found a biographer (*Saint Martin, Le Philosophe Inconnu*, Paris, 1862. Pp. 460) in M. Matter, formerly professor at the Protestant Theological Faculty at Strasburg, and well known by his book on Gnosticism, a General Church History, and other works. Mr. Matter avows himself to be an enthusiastic admirer of Saint Martin. He pronounces him to have been a brilliant thinker, a tender soul, the most celebrated of the mystic writers of our age, a perfect sage. Thanks to fortunate discoveries and indefatigable researches, Mr. Matter has been able to be more complete than any of his predecessors, both in narrating the life of Saint Martin and in analyzing his works. His work is, in particular, a rich mine of information for all who wish to study the nature and history of mysticism.

One of the most popular writers of French Protestantism, Felix Bungener, has published his Lectures on Calvin, his Life, his Work, and his Writings. (*Calvin. Sa Vie, Son Oeuvre, et ses Ecrits*. Paris, 1862.) There has been of late, in Geneva itself, a quite lively controversy on the character of Calvin. Julius Barei, Pro-

fessor of History at the Academy of Geneva, in a series of lectures on the Martyrs of Free Thought, was very severe on Calvin, on account of the part he took in the burning of Servetus, and called him both the denouncer and the executioner of Servetus. Against these attacks Bungener defends the honor of Calvin, finding exculpatory arguments in the character of the times, and concluding with the words, "And now, if you are able, cast a stone at him."

German and French periodicals commend highly a new work on the relation of Christianity to civilization, (*Le Genie des Civilisations*, par J. P. Trottet, tom. 1, 2.) The author expresses as the aim of his work to aid in the restoration of a Christian society in a time of decay and despondency. The true spirit of Christianity, and its world-reforming power, shall be comprehended more fully and profoundly by a historical cognition of human society in its center, in its innermost substance, in the principles of the spiritual life of history. Mr. Trottet insists that in order to comprehend fully the facts, the ruins and remains of past ages, we must first of all understand the mental faculties of the nations which gave to them their particular kind of existence, and the impulses of that conscience which worked out their destiny. We must have an intimate knowledge of the process of development of the ages that preceded us, in order to see clearly at what stage in the development of the race we have arrived, and what duties our age demands from us. But the most important question for the historian who holds this view of the development of the human race, is to fix the relation of Christianity to human nature to the history of our age. The history of civilization must be able to show that we have the right to proclaim, in the future as in the past, Christianity as the salvation of the world. It must be made the true science of apologetics for our age. The two volumes published by Mr. Trottet are confined to ancient history, and treat in three sections: 1. Of the ante-historic epoch; 2. Of the progressive civilizations whose principle had a formative power; and, 3. Of Jewish theocracy. The author expected soon to follow up these two volumes by that part of his work which treated of modern civilization, when a sudden death overtook him.

The indefatigable Abbé Migne publishes in the French papers a complete list of the theological works issued from his extensive establishment in Paris. They comprise, among others, a complete edition of the Church Fathers of the Latin Church from the apostolical age to the times of Innocent III.; of those of the Greek Church to Photius; and another series embracing the Greek writers who were or are claimed to have been in favor of a union between the Greek and Roman Churches from the time of Photius to the Council of Florence; a collection of Commentaries on the Old and New Testament; a collection of standard Roman Catholic works on Dogmatics, and another of standard works on Ecclesiastical Law; another of Apologies for Christianity and for the Roman Church; another of Roman

Catholic Pulpit Orators; Dictionaries of the Bible, of Sacred Philology, of Liturgy, of Ecclesiastical Law, of Heresies, of Councils, of Religious Orders, of Religions, of Sacred Geography, of Moral and Mystical Theology, etc.; a Church History by Henrion, in 25 volumes; editions of the complete works of a number of distinguished Roman Catholic writers of France. Altogether the list comprises 2,000 volumes, which cost 10,000 francs. A new work has recently been commenced, which, in 16 volumes, is to contain "Historical Researches on the Ancient Nations and their Religious Worship, to serve as an introduction into the fundamental points of Christianity in general and Catholicism in particular." It is edited by Abbé Desroches. (*Recherches Historiques sur les Peuples Anciens.* Paris, 1862.)

ART. X.—SYNOPSIS OF THE QUARTERLIES, AND OTHERS OF THE HIGHER PERIODICALS.

American Quarterly Reviews.

AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN AND THEOLOGICAL REVIEW, January, 1863. (New York.)—1. Hard Matter. 2. Dörner on the Sinless Perfection of Jesus. 3. Bulgarian Popular Songs. 4. Laboulaye on the United States of America. 5. Baptism for the Dead. 6. Cairnes on the Slave Power. 7. Belief of the Indians in Inferior Spirits. 8. Politics and the Pulpit.

THE BIBLICAL REPERTORY AND PRINCETON REVIEW, January, 1863. (Princeton, N. J.)—1. Hopkins's Moral Science. 2. The Liberties of the Gallican Church. 3. The Skepticism of Science. 4. Training of the Children. 5. Dr. Nicholas Murray. 6. The True Place of Man in Zoology. 7. The War.

THE BOSTON REVIEW, January, 1863. (Boston, Mass.)—1. Atonement. 2. The English Woman at Home. 3. Obligation and Ability. 4. Victor Hugo's "Les Misérables." 5. The Sixth Day of Creation. 6. Mrs. Stowe's Recent Novels. 7. Richard de Bury. 8. Short Sermons.

THE EVANGELICAL QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1863. (Gettysburg, Pa.)—1. The Miraculous Triumphs of the Early Church. 2. Why did Jesus Pray? 3. Rationalism and Supranaturalism. 4. The Union of Christ and Believers. 5. Exposition of Mark ix, 49. 6. Christianity and Politics. 7. Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman. 8. An Efficient Ministry. 9. The Dignity of the Ministerial Office. 10. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers.

THE NEW ENGLANDER, January, 1863. (New Haven, Conn.)—1. Goethe's "Faust." 2. The Legal Rights of Married Women. 3. A Chapter on Character Writing. 4. Financial Aspects of the Rebellion. 5. Doubt, Faith, and Reason. 6. Religious Liberty since the Reformation.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA AND BIBLICAL REPOSITORY, January, 1863. (Andover, Mass.)—1. The German Reformed Church. 2. English Lexicography. 3. The Moral and Religious Value of our National Union. 4. Athens; or, *Æsthetic Culture and the Art of Expression*. 5. The Doctrine of the Annihilation of the Wicked.

The article on the German Reformed Church in America is a blending of theology and history. It possesses a degree of interest as a history of a Church which for a while began to expand in this country with the Christian spirit of the age, but has latterly undergone a subjection to a very thorough conservatism. The result does and will, we think, appear in a consequent inefficiency in extending its evangelical power, and in winning a world to Christ. The Foreign Literary Intelligence, from the pen of W. F. W., promises to be interesting and valuable. We hold that the first quarterly for our ministry to take is the Methodist; the next is the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

DANVILLE REVIEW, December, 1862. (Danville, Ky.)—1. Imputation and Original Sin. 2. Mental Science. 3. De Ethice. 4. Politics and the Church. 5. Studies on the Bible: No. 3, The Wonders in Egypt. 6. Negro Slavery and the Civil War.

The article on Imputation is the conclusion of a series by Rev. R. W. Landis, displaying a great mastery of the erudition of the subject, and dealing with Dr. Hodge with much force and some severity. Dr. Breckenridge has an extended plea against the President's Proclamation of Freedom. It is not by any means written in the spirit of senators Davis and Powell. Our reply to it would be brief. *A restoration of the Union without the cessation of slavery would be but an armistice pregnant with future war.* Abolition is the sole path, short and sure, to peace; and the sooner it is taken, the shorter, surer, and happier.

English Reviews.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW, January, 1863. (London.)—

1. Readjustment of Christianity. 2. Hippolytus's Homily against Noetus.
3. The Philosophy of the Unconditioned Examined. 4. Theories of the Lord's Day, Dominical and Sabbatarian. 5. The Greek Testament of Webster and Wilkinson. 6. The Revision of the Prayer Book. 7. The Literature of Pascal's Thoughts. 8. The Matter of Prophecy. 9. Mr. Russell's Letter to the Bishop of Oxford. 10. Dr. Cunningham's Historical Theology.

THE CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER, January, 1863. (London.)—1. Brizeux's Life and Works. 2. The Relation of Calvinism to Modern Doubt. 3. Arthur Hugh Clough. 4. Saisset on Pantheism. 5. Christopher North. 6. The American Church in the Disruption. 7. The Past and Present of the Mormons. 8. The Clergy Relief Bill. 9. Scotch Liturgical Matters. 10. Recent Latitudinarianism.

FOURTH SERIES, VOL. XV.—22

THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1863. (London.)—1. Thiers's Romance of the Campaign of 1815. 2. The Legal Status of the Anglo-Catholic. 3. Sir Philip Sidney, his Life and Writings. 4. Mr. Herbert Spencer's First Principles. 5. "Les Misérables." 6. Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch. 7. The State of Greece.

JOURNAL OF SACRED LITERATURE AND BIBLICAL RECORD, January, 1863. (London.)—1. Bishop Colenso and the Pentateuch: the Criticism of Arithmetic. 2. The Protestant Clergy in Bohemia. 3. Reuss's "History of Christian Theology." 4. The Dublin Codex Rescriptus. 5. Exegesis of Difficult Texts. 6. Marcus Antoninus a Persecutor. 7. The Interpretation of Scripture. 8. The Egyptian Dynasties of Manetho. 9. Notes on Bishop Colenso's New Book.

THE LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW, January, 1863. (New York: reprint.)—1. Peru. 2. Institutes for Working Men. 3. Constitutional Government in Russia. 4. New Testament. 5. The Ticket-of-Leave System. 6. South Kensington Museum and Loan Exhibition. 7. Life of John Wilson. 8. The Stanhope Miscellanies. 9. Four Years of a Reforming Administration.

THE LONDON REVIEW, (Wesleyan,) January, 1863. (London.)—1. Davidson on the Old Testament. 2. The Pictures in the late Exhibition. 3. St. Clement's Eve. 4. The British Association at Cambridge. 5. The Revolution of 1848. 6. Ten Years of Imperialism in France. 7. Apostolic Theology. 8. Nova Scotia and her Resources. 9. Greek Testament Literature. 10. The Established Church: Defects and Remedies.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW, January, 1863. (New York: reprint.)—1. English Convicts: What should be Done with them. 2. The Literature of Bohemia. 3. Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch. 4. Les Misérables, by Victor Hugo. 5. Indian Annexations: British Treatment of Native Princes. 6. The Microscope and its Revelations. 7. Greece and the Greeks. 8. M. Rattazzi and his Administration.

THE NATIONAL REVIEW, January, 1863. (London.)—1. Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch. 2. Orley Farm. 3. The Crisis in Prussia. 4. Shelley's Poetical Mysticism. 5. Eternal Punishment. 6. The Law of Maritime Capture and Blockade. 7. Home Life in Denmark and Norway. 8. The Flavian Cæsars. 9. Learning in the Church of England. 10. Lancashire in 1862.

The article on Eternal Punishment is earnest and trenchant. It claims that that doctrine underlies the great body of the skepticism of the present day; that the Church of England, if irrevocably committed, must fall; but that the Church of England is not in fact so committed.

German Reviews.

DORPATER ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR THEOLOGIE UND KIRCHE. (Dorpat Journal for Theology and Church. Edited by the Professors of the Theological Faculty at Dorpat, Russia. Fourth Number. 1863.)—1. Dr. VON ENGELHARDT, The Religious and Moral Life of Paganism: India and Greece. 2. Dr. VON OETTINGEN, Regeneration through Infant Baptism. 3. WILIGERODE, A Visit in Hermannsburg. 4. CARLBLOM, Review of the Lutheran Dogmatics of Dr. Kahn.

Germany has of late produced a considerable number of able works on the pagan religions; both on the nature and history of paganism

in general, and on the religions of several countries in particular. Many of these works have greatly enlarged our knowledge of the religious systems of paganism, especially those of Asia, the information on which has been largely derived from sources formerly entirely unknown. Some of the chief results of these modern investigations with regard to Greece and India form the subject of the first article in the Dorpat Review, which has been prepared by the Professor of Church History at Dorpat. The article is chiefly based on Nägelsbach's Homeric Theology and the Post-Homeric Theology of the Popular Greek Faith, Köppen's Religion of Buddha and its Origin, Leo's Lectures on the History of the German people, the Works of Roth and Weber on India, and those of Wuttke and Döllinger on Paganism. At the conclusion of his able and very interesting article the author infers, as clearly proved by the history of Greek and Indian paganism, first, That the human race did not proceed as it now is from the hand of the Creator, since in that case men in their helplessness, in their sin without redemption, in their hunger and thirst without satisfaction, would be condemned to everlasting torments and the Sisyphean labor of an eternal and fruitless search after God; and second, that Christianity is not the natural fruit of human development, but rests on the revelation of God through his Son.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR WISSENSCHAFTLICHE THEOLOGIE. (Journal for Scientific Theology. Edited by A. Hilgenfeld, Professor at Jena. 1863. First number.)—1. HILGENFELD, The Theology of the Nineteenth Century, and its Relation to Religion and Christianity, with Particular Reference to the Work of Dr. Baur. 2. MERX, a Critical Investigation of the Sacrificial Laws, Lev. i-vii. 3. DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS, The Lamentation of Jesus over Jerusalem and the *Σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, Matt. xxiii, 34-39; Luke xi, 49-51; xiii, 34 *et seq.* 4. E. ZELLER, On James i, 12. 5. HILGENFELD, the Johannean Theology.

Dr. Strauss, the author of the "Life of Jesus," was understood to have renounced theological studies forever; but here he appears again in a theological Quarterly of Germany with an original article. The author does not seem to have modified any of his Rationalistic views about the origin of the books of the New Testament. He tries to prove in this article that the words in which Christ prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem were not spoken by him, but taken from a book entitled *Σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ*, (Wisdom of God,) which, according to him, was written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem. The existence of a Jewish book under the title "Wisdom of God," had been, before Strauss, assumed by Ewald and Bleek; yet Ewald considered it to have been written in the fifth century before Christ.

In the first article, Professor Hilgenfeld, of Jena, gives—on the basis of the posthumous work of the late Professor Baur of Tübingen on the Church History of the Nineteenth Century—a brief survey of the development of German theology in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and in particular discusses the influence on it of Kant, Fichte, Hegel, Schelling, and Schleiermacher. The book of Baur is utterly destructive in its character. It condemns the “old faith” of Christianity; it rejects the mediation attempted between the old faith and modern science by Schleiermacher; but it nowhere clearly states what is to take the place of the former faith of the Christian world. It dismisses its readers with the poor advice that every one must try the best he can to settle for himself the irreconcilable contest between the old faith and modern science. Hilgenfeld is less opposed to the theories of Schleiermacher than Baur; but he likewise fails to give us a clear view of what would remain of Christianity if the old Bible Christianity were taken away.

♦ ♦ ♦

French Reviews:

REVUE DES DEUX MONDES.—December 1, 1862.—1. KLACZKO, The Union Movement in Germany. 5. MAZADE, Meditations of a Liberal Priest. 8. BLERZY, Submarine Telegraphs.

December 15.—1. ESQUIROS, England and English Life, (eighteenth article.) 3. DU HAILLY, The Acadians and Nova Scotia. 5. MAZADE, Count André Zamoyski and Marquis Wielopolski. 7. LEMOINNE, The Greek Revolution of 1862.

January 1, 1863.—1. CH. DE REMUSAT, The Mission of Authors. 9. VERDEIL, The Cotton Famine.

In the article entitled *Meditations of a Liberal Priest*, in the number of December 1, we are made acquainted with some of the recent writings of Father Gratry, one of the leaders of the liberal catholic school in France. Roman Catholicism has never, perhaps, had a school which united so much eminent talent; we need only point to Count Montalembert, Father Lacordaire, Bishop Dupanloup, Prince Broglie, M. de Falloux, Ch. Lenormant, the astronomer Leverrier, all of whom rank among the first scholars of France, and nearly all of whom have been elected members of the French Academy. Their works have given them a world-wide reputation. Their earnest Christianity has been acknowledged by all Protestant writers, and their literary ability is acknowledged by all parties. Father Gratry is the philosopher of the school, and he is generally regarded as one of the best French philosophical writers now living. He has written numerous works, the three most recent of which, *Les Sources*, a treatise on the education of the spirit and the science of duty; *La Paix*, historical and religious meditations on

the influence of religion on society; and *Commentaire sur l'Evangile Selon Saint Mathieu*, are reviewed in the article of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which highly recommends them.

REVUE CHRETIENNE.—November 15, 1862.—1. NAVILLE, The Oriental Studies of M. Franck. 2. KUHN, Essay on Voltaire.

December 1.—ROSSEUW SAINT-HILAIRE, Calvin according to his most recent Biographers. 2. VULLIEMIN, Louvois, according to the Work of Camille Rousset. 3. MEYLAN, The Origin of Christmas. 4. SCHAEFFER, Saint Martin.

Few of the foreign periodicals contain so interesting a list of articles as the *Revue Chretienne*. Each of the six articles of the two monthly numbers noticed above will be sure to attract the attention of most of the subscribers of the Review, and each one is sure to rivet the attention of those who have commenced their reading. We have felt a particular interest in the article on Voltaire, which gives a beautiful sketch of the frivolous character of the celebrated French deist, and of the atheistical company of scholars who assembled at the Prussian court, in compliance with an invitation of Frederick II.; also in the biographical sketch of Calvin, by Professor Rosseeuw Saint-Hilaire, one of the most eminent French historians of our age. Like all contributors of the Review, Professor Saint-Hilaire is an admirer of the United States, and regards in particular the relation between Church and State as it exists in our country as a model that ought to be followed by all Europe.

ART. XI.—QUARTERLY BOOK-TABLE.

Religion, Theology, and Biblical Literature.

The Canon of the Holy Scriptures Examined in the Light of History. By Prof. L. GAUSSEN, of Geneva, Switzerland, Author of "Theopneusty," "Birthday of Creation," etc. Translated from the French, and abridged by Edward N. Kirk, D.D. 12mo., pp. 463. Boston: American Tract Society.

This book, as we noted in a former number, is a portion of a larger work by Gausсен, prepared in opposition to the movement of Scherer. The work on Theopneusty, written by the same author, introduced to our country by the same translator, has had an extensive circulation; and its great influence in sustaining the higher views in regard to inspiration in the United States alone is an ample moral reward to the learned and eloquent author. The present work is superior in execution to the Theopneusty, if not calculated for so palpable an effect. There is a finer finish of style, and fewer adventurous positions and doubtful argumentations.

In what manner and by what authority were the books constituting our present New Testament selected and credited with a divine authority? The skeptic and the Romanist put this question, each with a different purpose: the former to overthrow Christianity, the latter to establish the sole authority of the Church, that is, of the Romish Church. A notion prevails that the selection was made by ecclesiastical councils; and the suspicion is cherished that it was by an arbitrary and unfounded process, leaving out other works quite as well entitled to divine honors as the constituents of the present canon. To this our eloquent author furnishes the full reply. He shows that as the successive books came from their authors, there is satisfactory ground for the conclusion that they were immediately accepted by the body of the Christian Churches with complete unanimity; that their autographs were, some of them, deposited in archives of the particular Churches; that they were accepted and read from Sabbath to Sabbath; that copies were taken and spread broadcast during the apostolic day, and widely scattered through the Churches of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and that they were received without dissent, with a free spontaneous faith, as the authoritative exposition of Christian doctrine, as the canonical Scripture of the New Dispensation. After these canonical books were written an interim of silence appears. Few or no Christian writings are issued. But the moment this silence is broken, a new class of eminent intellects hold the pen, and from them we learn that while the Christian Church forms an immense body throughout the world, eight ninths of our present New Testament are held by her unanimous voice, are installed as the divine charter of her existence, and the infallible standard of her faith, order, and practice. When asked who selected the books of the canon, we might well answer, Nobody selected them; they took their place spontaneously. They formed into a body of themselves, with the unanimous concurrence of the witnessing Church.

And this age, in whose sacred silence the canon was born, was the age of the apostolical martyr Church, governed by regents selected by Christ himself, in full possession of miraculous gifts and the power of the discerning of spirits. Were we to say, then, that the books were singly written by individuals animated by no special inspiration, but by only the ordinary measure of the Spirit then vouchsafed to the eminent and holy men in the Church; that they uttered only in the most truthful spirit the facts of the Gospel narrative, or in the most wise and devout spirit the doctrines and sentiments of Christianity; what then? We nevertheless have a canon every line and word of which is accepted and indorsed as

the rule of faith, the word of history, the doctrine of Christ. Peter erred, and Paul was excited; but the sacred canon depends not on Peter or Paul singly, or upon Matthew or Luke, but additionally upon the concurrent acceptance and ratification of the Pentecostal Church. What was the nature of the individual inspiration of each writer is, then, a question of justifiable and rational curiosity. It is a proper subject of investigation in the light of reason and Scripture; but we doubt whether it is one in which the divine authority of the New Testament or the Old is so deeply involved as is generally supposed. Should a man tell us, "I cannot believe that the words of the New Testament, with all their solecisms, tangled sentences, ambiguities, and incomplete expressions of the thought, are dictated by divine wisdom;" we should reply, "But at any rate those words were *sanctioned* by the charismatic Church as the true expression, in their proper meaning, of the Christian faith."

The present volume is intended as a popular exhibition of the doctrine of the canon, and as such we cannot conceive of anything more admirable. To render such a topic popular is a very difficult task; and yet there are many lay inquirers, young and old, who have their thoughts and their misgivings, to whom books of an infidel character are accessible, who need an antidote like this, which shall attract by its life, clearness, and eloquence, while it instructs and convinces by its argument. And, we may add, there are many of our ministry who will find it a very refreshing and confirming volume.

The Life of our Lord upon Earth; Considered in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations. By SAMUEL J. ANDREWS. 12mo., pp. 624. New York: Charles Scribner. 1862.

The popular reader will need to consume little time in discerning that Mr. Andrews has prepared for him no light reading, no graceful pictorial narrative, to beguile him into tracing the events of our Lord's life as he would the scenes of a romance. Just as expeditiously the scholar will find that he is dealing with no ordinary master of the erudition of the subject treated, and that deep and serious work is before him in these pages.

Assuming, with a reverent yet free spirit, the authenticity and historical truth of the four Gospels, omitting all discussion of points of theology, exegesis, archaeology, or verbal criticism, Mr. Andrews applies his strength to questions of the chronological order, the harmonizing of the different Gospels with each other and with cotemporaneous history, and the geographical localities of the Gospel events. His volume opens with an elaborate discussion of

nearly fifty pages of fine print, of the dates of the Saviour's birth, baptism, and death. The two genealogies are sifted, and the conclusion adopted that while Mary is of the royal line, yet both pedigrees given are Joseph's. The nature of the relationship of the Lord's "brethren" is debated, including the point of the perpetual virginity of the blessed Mother, and the conclusion diffidently attained that the "brethren" were truly uterine half-brothers. The train of discussions through the work, of which these are specimens, is conducted in a spirit of passionless candor, patience, learning, and modesty, which render the work a credit to American scholarship. The best research of Germany, France, England, and America is laid under contribution; but while a due deference is paid to authority, the conclusions are evidently wrought out with much original investigation, and in a spirit of unassuming but manly independence.

Reconstruction of Biblical Theories; or, Biblical Science improved in its History, Chronology, and Interpretation, and relieved from Traditionary Errors and Unwarrantable Hypotheses. By LEICESTER AMBROSE SAWYER, Translator of the Scripture, etc. 12mo., pp. 195. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. New York: James Miller. 1862.

Mr. Sawyer interprets the old Hebrew documents in accordance with the theories of development and a limitless chronology. He accomplishes his object by first resolving the sacred writings into fragments of allegory and tradition; and from this plastic state he can of course "reconstruct" them to any eligible form. Adam is the name of the race in its brutal or semi-brutal stage; Eden is the woodland in which he roamed naked and not ashamed. Language, wherewith he names his inferior beasts, is his first attainment. Eve discovers a fruit which she sees to be tempting and fears to be poisonous, until she sees that it is eaten by the serpent race, or rather, by "a pet serpent" kept by her; and by eating it man attains the age of reason and morality. What sort of fruit this was is doubted. Some think it was the apple; but Mr. Sawyer, though he entertains great respect for the apple, excludes it. Some think it was the fig; but Mr. Sawyer, though he esteems the fig, cannot accept the fig. He finally decides that this fruit, eaten by the serpent and growing on a tree, is—*wheat*, including all the cereals. Man next, attaining the sense of decency, invents garments, first of leaves, and subsequently, by arriving at the art of tannery, of leather. Ages pass, and men emigrate to the highlands of India, which is commemorated under the legend of the Flood; and the ark was simply the dry-goods box in which their effects were packed for traveling. The race was still further improved by the mountain air. Through

countless ages since has it been advancing, until at last it has attained to a true interpretation of its own genetic documents, as it is presented in this book of Mr. Sawyer's. The book, then, at the present moment, is the ultimate point of human attainment.

The Words of the Lord Jesus. By RUDOLPH STIER, D.D., Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkenditz. Translated from the revised and enlarged German edition, by the Rev. WILLIAM B. POPE, Manchester, Eng. Revised by JAMES STRONG, S.T.D., and HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., Professor in Union Theological Seminary, New York. 8vo., pp. 144. New York: Ministers' Library Association. N. Tibbals, Agent.

This is the Part First of an American reprint of Pope's translation of Stier, to be issued monthly, at seventy-five cents per number. It is done up in a handsome plain style, in close double columns, and in clear but not large type. It is brought by its cheapness and easy terms of payment within the reach of most preachers and biblical scholars. The reputation of the American revisers, it is unnecessary for us to say, is a pledge for the thorough scholarly character of anything that comes from their hands. It is equally unnecessary for us to restate our high estimate of the richness, depth, and beauty, in the midst of much diffuseness, to be found in Stier's pages. There is little that the evangelical Church generally would desire to expurgate. The peculiarity, which he shares with Müller and perhaps Tholuck, of holding to some mode of reconciliation with God, perhaps in the intermediate state, after death, is the most objectionable point; but that seldom appears, and is never pointedly obtruded. We trust that this brave venture of Mr. Tibbals in these stormy times will prove a success.

The Spiritual Point of View; or, the Glass Reversed. An Answer to Bishop Colenso. By M. MAHAN, D.D., St.-Mark's-in-the-Bowery Professor, etc. 8vo., pp. 114. New York: Appletons. 1863.

This little volume does not profess to be a complete and formal reply to all of Bishop Colenso's objections to "the historical character" of the Pentateuch; it only aims to show the essential infidelity and partisan unfairness of the bishop's method of handling the word of God. This it accomplishes effectually. Chapter XI, on the Character of Scripture History, is a very clear exposition of that subject. We cannot say that we regard Professor Mahan's incidental attempts to clear up the *mystery* of the Scripture numbers as particularly happy. We are decidedly of the opinion that these are to be taken in their literal exactness, except where liable to the suspicion of textual corruption in the process of transcription.

Philosophy, Metaphysics, and General Science.

Manual of Geology: treating of the Principles of the Science, with Special Reference to American Geological History. For the use of Colleges, Academies, and Schools of Science. By JAMES D. DANA, M.A., LL.D., Silliman Professor of Geology and Natural History in Yale College. Illustrated by a Chart of the World, and over One Thousand Figures, mostly from American Sources. 8vo., pp. 814. Philadelphia: Theodore Bliss & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1863. Price, \$4.

"There is, perhaps, no part of the world," says the Atlantic Monthly, "certainly none familiar to science, where the early geological periods can be studied with so much ease and precision as in the United States." Availing himself of this important fact, the distinguished Silliman Professor in Yale has, in the goodly volume before us, given a new and interesting phase to the study of Geology in the numerous Academies and Colleges, where it will undoubtedly be adopted as a classic. He has given this science naturalization papers on American soil. Without at all destroying the catholicity of the science, he has Americanized it. Thereby the pupil, in mastering the theory of the science, becomes practically familiar with the geological character of the various sections of his own country.

Professor Dana divides Geology into four general compartments: I. PHYSIOGRAPHIC GEOLOGY, in which are presented the *general features of the earth*. II. LITHOLOGICAL GEOLOGY, which gives us the character of the *rocks*, their elements, method of making, and stratifications. III. HISTORICAL GEOLOGY, or the earth's changes in relation to time, in which *paleontology* discloses her wonders. IV. DYNAMICAL GEOLOGY, or a contemplation of the *forces* by which these changes are transacted. In this beautiful arrangement, every topic which this young science has yet developed finds its own appropriate place.

There are three points of contact between Geology and Theology, of special interest to every thoughtful man; namely, Cosmogony, the Antiquity of the human race, and its Unity. On the last two of these three, Professor Dana takes those higher views which recognize Man as belonging only to the Historical Period, and as forming a sole genus, whose unique qualities of mind indicate relations to a higher sphere than the mere material. Of the five geologic Ages, the last is the Age of Man and Mind. Certainly the man of science, unless he willfully chooses to make a stupid cephalopod of himself, must recognize that in the Age of Man we arrive at a being in whose brain the conception of an all-comprehensive Mind, overspreading and grasping the ages of change, and the conception

of the underlying world, revolving through these changes, have been able to meet. In spite of Sir William Hamilton, man's mind does conceive or at least *receive* the Idea of the Infinite; and between a mind that cannot conceive this Idea and the mind that can, there is a difference in degree which no difference in cranial capacity or magnitude can adequately represent.

The Westminster Review remarks that the post-tertiary age of the earth is now the battle-field on which is fought the question of the antiquity of the human race. Professor Dana concedes the existence of fossil man, and gives an engraving of the Guadeloupe skeleton, the inferences from which are rebutted by quietly mentioning also "the remains of Caribs killed in a fight with a neighboring tribe two centuries ago." He concedes the arrow-heads of Abbeville and other similar discoveries, to which our *Quarterly* has heretofore adverted, and adds, "The facts appear to place it beyond doubt that man began to exist before the extinction of the post-tertiary races." But he soon as quietly notes that

Prestwich also remarks that "the evidence" from the occurrence of human relics with the bones of extinct animals, "as it at present stands, does not seem to me to necessitate the carrying of Man back in past time, so much as the bringing forward of the extinct animals toward our own time; my own previous opinion, founded on an independent study of the superficial drift or pleistocene (post-tertiary) deposits, having likewise been certainly in favor of this view."

Professor Dana afterward remarks,

But until Asia has been fully explored, and found to afford corresponding facts, the term should be regarded as belonging to European history rather than to that of the human race; and so also with all conclusions with regard to the characteristics of the earliest of mankind derived from the forms of bones or skulls. Geology here passes over the continuation of the history of man to Archaeology.

We have then an intimation of the Edenic and Human period in the following:

The observations thus far made appear to accord with the view, already expressed, that in the Terrace epoch there occurred both the decline of the post-tertiary races and the introduction of the modern tribes of mammals, together with the creation of Man. Other animal tribes must have been at the same time replenished, especially those of birds and insects, which are terrestrial. Among fruits and flowers it is not improbable that many kinds were introduced that added both to the beauty and wealth of the finished world.

The whole section entitled "Man of One Species," is full of interest.

In cosmogony, Professor Dana adopts the nebular theory, with the processes of development traced by Guyot. The six Mosaic days of creation, then, being great mundane periods, are divisible into double threes; and these double threes are found traceable in the actual processes of creation. The double threes are nearly the same as we have given from Mr. Rorison in a former number of the

Quarterly; and we are gratified that science here discovers an accordance between the Mosaic and scientific cosmogony.

The account recognizes in creation two great eras of three days each; an *Inorganic* and an *Organic*.

Each of these eras opens with the appearance of light: the *first*, light cosmical; the *second*, light from the sun for the special uses of the earth.

Each era ends in a "day" of two great works; the two shown to be distinct by being severally pronounced "good." On the *third* "day," that closing the *Inorganic* era, there was first the dividing of the land from the waters, and afterward the creation of vegetation, or the institution of a kingdom of life; a work widely diverse from all preceding it in the era. So on the *sixth* "day," terminating the *Organic* era, there was first the creation of mammals, and then a second far greater work, totally new in its grandest element, the creation of Man.

The arrangement is, then, as follows:

1. *The Inorganic Era.*

1st Day.—LIGHT, cosmical.

2d Day.—The earth divided from the fluid around it, or individualized.

3d Day.—
 { 1. Outlining of the land and water.
 { 2. Creation of vegetation.

2. *The Organic Era.*

4th Day.—LIGHT, from the sun.

5th Day.—Creation of the lower orders of animals.

6th Day.—
 { 1. Creation of mammals.
 { 2. Creation of Man.

In addition, the last day of each era included one work typical of the era, and another related to it in essential points, but also prophetic of the future. Vegetation, while, for physical reasons, a part of the creation of the third day, was also prophetic of the future *Organic* era, in which the progress of life was the grand characteristic. The record thus accords with the fundamental principle in history that the characteristic of an age has its beginnings within the age preceding. So, again, man, while like other mammals in structure, even to the homologies of every bone and muscle, was endowed with a spiritual nature, which looked forward to another era, that of spiritual existence. The *seventh* "day," the day of rest from the work of creation, is man's period of preparation for that new existence; and it is to promote this special end that, in strict parallelism, the Sabbath follows man's six days of work.

The work is adjusted with the skill of a practical teacher to the objects of academic and collegiate instruction. It is perspicuous in language, lucid in its arrangement, copiously furnished with illustrations, and a brief synopsis is added in the appendix, as a basis for a shorter course of instruction. The work may be recommended both to the use of schools and for the libraries of our literary men and ministers.

The Institutes of Medicine. By THOMAS PAINE, M.D., LL.D., Professor of Medicine and Materia Medica in the University of the City of New York. Seventh Edition. 8vo., pp. 1130. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1862.

The issue of a seventh edition of a professional work evinces to outsiders its standard character. The first publication of this volume was in 1847; since which time it has received the highest sanction from leading organs of the profession in America, and has contributed to win for the author a cluster of European honors.

Medicine, of the regular and orthodox Medical Church, has its polemics and its sects. Of the two great schools, (to say nothing of the class of compromisers intermediate,) namely, the Chemical and the Vital, Dr. Paine is a leader if not the head of the latter. When the science of chemistry began to rise into a brilliant and widely pervading system, Liebig and others proposed to bring *materia medica* as a subordinate department within its limits. They endeavored to exclude from medical science the consideration of all other forces than the chemical, and to account for the functions and disorders of the system, and assign the remedies, from the laws shown by the laboratory to regulate inorganic matter. From the high character of these theorists, and the plausibility of their pretensions, they seemed for a while with a rush to carry everything before them. Medical science was thus tending to a system of low theoretic materialism. Against this torrent Professor Paine has stood, firm as a column of adamant. He took his stand upon the theory of Vitalism, and predicted, with a wisdom claimed to be verified much sooner than he expected, that the "invasion" of the territory of medicine by chemistry would end in defeat.

Dr. Paine's ground is, that there is a true Vital Principle, inaccessible in itself to the reach of the senses, yet controlling with its powers the functions of the system. Therapeutics must look for its remedies to the laws furnished by observation of the modes of vital action. This assumption shapes his whole system, and decides the character and contents of his whole book of *Institutes*. First we have *Physiology*, unfolding first the human structure and its composition, and then the nature and operation of the vital principle, the functions of life, both in themselves and as influenced by age, temperament, race, sex, etc. By this the *Pathology* is explained and the *Therapeutics* established. Therapeutically he belongs to the "heroic" school. Calomel and blood-letting form essential parts.

The medical theory of Dr. Paine leads him from the recognition of a vital principle to a recognition of a soul in man, as the seat of thought and source of voluntary action. A demonstration of the soul constitutes an extended chapter of his work. Whatever may be the character of his medical practice, its theory is spiritual and theistic. His style is living, and often belligerent. There is much that is interesting in his work to the general thinker and the theologian.

Dr. Paine is a firm opposer of modern geology. He has a treatise unpublished, in which he maintains that the earth is but a few

thousand years old, and that the creative week of Moses consisted of literal days; and so interpreted, the Mosaic narrative is true. Whatever may be his peculiarities of belief, all parties must bear testimony to his learning, genius, individuality, and pure independence of mind.

♦ ♦ ♦

History, Biography, and Topography.

Memoirs of Mrs. Joanna Bethune. By her Son, the Rev. GEORGE W. BETHUNE, D.D. With an Appendix, containing Extracts from the Writings of Mrs. Bethune. 12mo., pp. 250. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1863.

Probably no feminine names have been more thoroughly identified with the history of benevolent institutions in the city of New York than those of Mrs. Isabella Graham and her daughter, Mrs. Joanna Bethune. The character of the former, for piety and active benevolence, has been held up for the emulation of all the young women in this part of the religious world; nor is it unknown on the other side of the Atlantic. We have an excellent and widely circulated biography of this lady, which was prepared by her daughter and son-in-law, Mrs. Joanna and Mr. Divie Bethune; and upon the announcement of this memoir we had hoped for a work of corresponding interest: a companion volume. In this, however, we are obliged to acknowledge our disappointment. The "writings" are excellent, in spite of much sameness; but the biography proper is far too brief. True, there may be the best of reasons for this. The most actively benevolent people do not always leave an accurate record of their deeds; and when, as in the present case, the subject has outlived her colaborers by many years, we often find that while her praise may be on every tongue, very few connected details of special interest can be secured.

But further than this, whatever Dr. Bethune's abilities may have been as a "poet, scholar, preacher, and orator," he seems to us to have failed, in the present case, to appreciate the very first principle necessary to a biographical work; namely, to concentrate the main interest of the reader on the subject of the memoir. The various sketches given of the friends and colaborers of Mrs. Bethune, though interesting in themselves, are in some rather aristocratic instances quite irrelevant; while sketches of her nearest relatives, her husband, sisters, and children, are mostly omitted.

It is an interesting thought that while Mrs. Bethune lived to the remarkably advanced age of ninety-two years, her son hastened away almost immediately after her in the prime of manhood, and spent his last moments in erecting this monument to her memory.

Politics, Law, and General Morals.

Political Fallacies; an Examination of the False Assumptions and Refutation of the Sophistical Reasonings which have brought on this Civil War. By GEORGE JUNKIN, D.D., LL.D. 12mo., pp. 332. New York: Charles Scribner. 1863.

Dr. Junkin, whose is a noted name among the Old School Calvinists, has for more than a dozen years been President of Washington College, an institution in Lexington, Va., which was first endowed by the illustrious man whose name it bears. During the discussions of the past years upon the slavery question, he has maintained the position of a mediator, and we may add, of a compromiser. The crisis found him in the full possession of a high social position and a wide popularity. In his firm stand against secession he was twice sustained by an overwhelming majority of Virginia voters. But what could voice and vote do against violence? The brute force of a despotic minority "precipitated" the state from the Union and the unionists from the state. Dr. Junkin's first experience was the erection of a secession banner upon the turrets of his college, in defiance of his authority; his next, the refusal of his faculty to sustain his loyalty; his third, a speedy exodus from the college and the state. Such was the nature of this pro-slavery rebellion; such the destiny of compromise and moderation in dealing with its lawless and bloody despotism. It is the fierce movement of a black oligarchy, asserting, in defiance of law, reason, or human rights, its unsparing supremacy. The strangest part of it all is, that with all his experience of its temper and dealings, and with all his perception of the anarchical character of the doctrines of secessionism, and with all the ability of his exposure, Dr. Junkin still fails to comprehend the enemy he and we are compelled to encounter. He still prattles in some of his pages of the guilt of those who early saw the character and designs of the oligarchy, and stood in firm resistance to its insolence. He does not yet comprehend that but for the foresight and firmness of the class whom he denounces as Northern fanatics, this nation would have bowed beneath the iron sway of that accursed junto, and our republic would have been transformed, first in spirit and then in form, into a despotism. But for those northern fanatics, Dr. Junkin would never have dared to hold his position as a middle man. We can, however, indulge these prejudices and inconsistencies on his part. He has attested the sincerity of his opinions and the heroism of his metal by integrity in the trying hour, and the solemn ordeal of suffering.

The main purpose of Dr. Junkin's volume, and one which he has well performed, is the full exposure of the folly and fatality of the

doctrine of secession. This denationalizing heresy, which robs us of a country and gives us an anarchy, was the terrible bequest of that darkest, deepest, and most unscrupulous of all American traitors—in comparison with whose blackness and grandeur Benedict Arnold is white and Aaron Burr an animalcule—the infamous John C. Calhoun. Placing himself at the head of the slavery plot, this dogma was forged by him in the interest of slavery. At that time Andrew Jackson saw his plan, predicted that slavery would be the next great basis of disunion, and lamented that he had not at the proper moment visited the traitor's neck with the traitor's doom. John C. Calhoun taught the southerner that phrase of sectional treason, "*My first allegiance is due my state,*" and Jefferson Davis and the rebellion are the consequence. Secessionism is national disintegration reduced to a theory.

♦ ♦ ♦

Educational.

A Manual of Information and Suggestions for Object Lessons, in a Course of Elementary Instruction adapted to the Use of the School and Family Charts, and other Aids in Teaching. By MARCIUS WILLSON, Author of "Willson's Historical Series," "School and Family Readers," etc., etc. 12mo., pp. 329. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1862.

This treatise is based upon what the author calls the "development system;" a plan of drawing out the perceptive faculties of the pupil by commenting upon and questioning him concerning various objects placed before him for his observation. A set of Charts of "Objects" is advertised to accompany this work, of which, however, we cannot speak from actual observation. J.

♦ ♦ ♦

Pamphlets.

Reviewers Reviewed. Brief Replies to various Criticisms and other Arguments. By C. F. HUDSON, author of "Debt and Grace as Related to the Doctrine of a Future Life." 18mo., pp. 44. New York: G. W. Carleton.

In this little primer, Mr. Hudson runs the gauntlet of his reviewers with a bravery unsurpassed this side of Vicksburg. He acknowledges a mistake or two of his own, but he finds the errors of his critics to be legion. So far as the Methodist Quarterly notices of him are concerned, we have no mistakes to acknowledge. One remark of ours, however, in regard to the Universalist views of the Greek words *αἰώνιος* and *ἀίδιος*, had, we admit, no proper application to his theory. We also concede that he is correct in saying that the note in the commentary by the editor of this Quarterly, on Mark ix, 43, is not sustained by the Greek. As to our other points, all things are as they were before the genesis of this last creation of Mr. Hudson's genius.